

MINUTES OF MEETING OF COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
HELD IN WASHINGTON, D. C., THURSDAY AND FRIDAY, DECEMBER 8 and 9, 1927.

The fifth meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts during the fiscal year 1928 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on Thursday and Friday, December 8 and 9, 1927.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Mowbray,
Mr. Garfield,
Mr. Morris,
Mr. Taft,
Mr. Vitale,
also Mr. H. P. Caemmerer, Secretary and

Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 9:30 a.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PRECEDING MEETINGS: The minutes of the meetings held September 28, and October 14, 1927, were approved.

2. UNITED CIGAR STORES BUILDING: Mr. Moore stated that at the request of Mr. Robert F. Beresford, Chairman of the Committee on Architecture of the Board of Trade, and President of the Washington Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, and Mr. Rufus S. Lusk, President of the Operative Builders Association of the District of Columbia, a conference was held in the rooms of the Commission early in November, attended by him and Mr. Caemmerer, also by Major Cary Brown, representing the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with Mr. H. G. Mitchell, Associate Architect of the United Cigar Stores Company, and Mr. Julius Wenig, architect of Washington, their local representative, to consider a design for a proposed building of the United Cigar Stores Company at 14th and E Streets, N.W., near Pennsylvania Avenue. The protest made was that the building as designed was inappropriate for such an important location near Pennsylvania Avenue, adjacent to the public buildings which are being built by the Government. The design showed that it was to be a two-story building, the first floor to be taken up by the store, with show windows, projecting three feet on the sidewalk (government property) its entire length of 149 feet on Fourteenth Street and about 32 feet on E Street, or a total of about 540 square feet of government property, to be erected under a revokable permit issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia; that as a result of the conference it was decided to bring the matter to the attention of the head officials of the United Cigar Stores Company in New York, who decided to and did forward the plans to the Commission for advice; that the plans were brought to the particular attention of Mr. Morris, who disapproved them as being a cheap type of office

The first meeting of the Commission of the District of Columbia was held on

February 1937 was held in its office in the Interior Department Building on

February 1937 and Friday, December 8 and 9, 1937.

The following members were present:

Mr. Moore, Chairman,
Mr. Fowling,
Mr. Harfield,
Mr. Morris,
Mr. Pitt,
Mr. Vitale,

Also Mr. H. A. Greenman, Secretary and

Executive Officer.

The meeting was called to order at 1:30 p.m.

1. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: The minutes of the meetings

held September 20, and October 1, 1937, were approved.

2. UNITED STATES BUILDING: Mr. Moore stated that at the request of

Mr. Robert E. Petersen, Chairman of the Committee on Architecture of the Board of Engineers, and President of the Washington Chapter of the American Institute of

Architects, and Mr. J. J. Smith, President of the Operative Builders

Association of the District of Columbia, a conference was held in the room of the Commission early in November, attended by him and Mr. Greenman, also by

Major George W. Brown, representing the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, with Mr. J. J. Smith, Associate Architect of the United States Capitol, and Mr. J. J. Smith, Architect of Washington, their local representative, to

consider a design for a proposed building of the United States Capitol, located at 14th and D Streets, N.W., near Pennsylvania Avenue. The project made was

that the building as designed was inappropriate for such an important location near Pennsylvania Avenue, adjacent to the public buildings which are being built

by the Government. The design showed that it was to be a two-story building, the first floor to be taken up by the store, with show windows, projecting three

feet on the sidewalk (Government property) its entire length of 145 feet on

fourteenth street and about 33 feet on D Street, or a total of about 178 square

feet of Government property, to be erected under a revocable permit issued by the Commission of the District of Columbia; that as a result of the conference

it was decided to bring the matter to the attention of the head officials of the United States Capitol, who decided to and did forward the plans

to the Commission for review; that the plans were brought to the attention of Mr. Morris, who disapproved them as being a cheap type of office

building and inappropriate for the location proposed; that a report was sent to the United Cigar Stores Company on November 29th disapproving the plans, but suggesting that the matter could be given further consideration at this meeting of the Commission.

The secretary stated that the local architect, Mr. Wenig, had called at the Office of the Commission a few days ago, saying that Mr. Mitchell had instructed him to proceed with the plans; but that as this threatened the construction of a cheap building adjacent to Pennsylvania Avenue, the representatives of the Board of Trade and of the press, when they heard of this, protested strongly against the erection of the proposed building, and particularly also Hon. Cyrenus Cole, in the House of Representatives, (Congressional Record, December 8, 1927, page 271), and Hon. Sol Bloom, of New York, who had advised the United Cigar Stores Company by telegraph that he would suggest to them that they better not erect a building in Washington that did not meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; that thereupon Mr. Wenig telephoned that Mr. Mitchell was coming from New York and they would like to appear before the Commission at this meeting for further consideration of the plans.

The Commission stated they would consider the plans for the building further, and thereupon Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Wenig appeared before the Commission.

Mr. Mitchell apologized for the excitement of the controversy and said he had no intention of erecting a building which would be a blot on Washington; that his company had thought the design acceptable, being of the usual office type of building erected by the United Cigar Stores Company throughout the country; but that he had come to consider the matter further with the Commission and so was open to criticism. Mr. Mitchell said he objected to the publicity given the letter sent to the Company, which he regarded an insult to him and to Mr. Wenig, as in their opinion the design was suitable for a commercial building, and in the matter of location his Company was not particularly concerned.

Mr. Moore said the letter was intended as an appeal to patriotism; that the Commission of Fine Arts did regard the location proposed for the building of great importance, and he felt there was nothing in the letter that he would regard insulting. Several of the members of the Commission asked that Mr. Moore read the letter, which he did, as follows:

November 29, 1927.

"Dear Sirs:

The problem presented by the design submitted by the United Cigar Stores Company is the first of a series of problems which are bound to arise in connection with the treatment of privately owned property on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the Treasury in view of the fact that Congress has decided to locate public buildings along the south side of that avenue between the points above indicated.

In theory, and in the minds of the people, Pennsylvania Avenue is one of the most significant thoroughfares in this country. It ranks high in its historic interest; it attains marked significance as the direct way between the Legislative and the Executive departments of the Government. It has been a matter of national reproach that this truly great avenue has been suffered to sink into blighted conditions by reason of the low

building and inappropriate for the location proposed; that a report was sent to the United States Congress on November 1917 disapproving the plans, but suggesting that the matter could be given further consideration at this meeting of the Commission.

The secretary stated that the local architect, Mr. Wesley, had called at the Office of the Commission a few days ago, saying that Mr. Mitchell had instructed him to proceed with the plans; but that as this threatened the construction of a cheap building adjacent to Pennsylvania Avenue, the representatives of the Board of Trade and of the press, when they heard of this, protested strongly against the erection of the proposed building, and particularly also Hon. Cyrus Dale, in the House of Representatives, (Congressional Record, December 5, 1917, page 271), and Hon. Sol Bloom, of New York, who had advised the United States Congress by telegram that he would suggest to them that they better not erect a building in Washington that did not meet with the approval of the Commission of Fine Arts; that thereupon Mr. Wesley telephoned that Mr. Mitchell was coming from New York and they would like to appear before the Commission at this meeting for further consideration of the plans.

The Commission stated they would consider the plans for the building further, and thereupon Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Wesley appeared before the Commission.

Mr. Mitchell apologized for the excitement of the controversy and said he had no intention of erecting a building which would be a blot on Washington; that his company had thought the design acceptable, being of the usual office type of building erected by the United States Government throughout the country; but that he had come to consider the matter further with the Commission and so was open to criticism. Mr. Mitchell said he objected to the publicity given the letter sent to the Company, which he regarded as an insult to him and to Mr. Wesley, as in their opinion the design was suitable for a commercial building, and in the matter of location his Company was not particularly concerned.

Mr. Moore said the letter was intended as an appeal to patriotism; that the Commission of Fine Arts had the location proposed for the building of great importance, and he felt there was nothing in the letter that he would regard as insulting. Several of the members of the Commission asked that Mr. Moore read the letter, which he did, as follows:

"Dear Sirs:
The problem presented by the design submitted by the United States Stores Company is the first of a series of problems which are bound to arise in connection with the treatment of privately owned property on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capitol to the Treasury in view of the fact that Congress has decided to locate public buildings along the south side of that Avenue between the points above indicated.
In theory, and in the minds of the people, Pennsylvania Avenue is one of the most significant thoroughfares in this country. It ranks high in the historic interest; it attracts national significance as the direct way between the legislative and the executive departments of the Government. It has been a matter of national reputation that this truly great Avenue has been suffered to sink into dilapidated conditions by reason of the low

character of the private buildings that line it. That reproach is about to disappear as to the south side of the avenue, as the new public buildings program already started progresses to its destined completion. As to the north side it is virtually assured that the Government will control from the Capitol to Sixth Street, leaving some seven blocks in private ownership. Several of these blocks are already occupied by buildings which have frontages to which exception cannot be taken at the present time.

The appearance of any new building, however, that is to be erected on the north side of the Avenue becomes a matter of concern both to those residents of Washington who are imbued with pride in the progressive development of a city destined to rank among the most orderly and most beautiful ever build by man; and also to the whole people of the United States, who are gladly spending their thought and wealth on their National Capital.

All of these people feel--and have a right to feel--that the new building program, so long awaited, should have the encouragement and support of all private property owners, and that no structure should be erected out of harmony with the proposed development. Their right to such a feeling is based on the fact that it is the labors and the expenditures of the Government which give commercial value to Avenue frontage.

The fact that such a feeling exists has brought about the submission of the plans of the United Cigar Stores Company's proposed building at the northeast corner of Pennsylvania Avenue and Fourteenth Street.

The location is one of the most commanding of all the sites on the Avenue. It will face an open square of great dignity and planned to be of much beauty. The neighboring buildings for the most part possess dignity of mass and material, and some of them can claim architectural merit. The older ones must soon give place to structures which will yield returns in keeping with the enhancing value of the land. It is a matter of concern that all new structures shall be in keeping with the sense of dignity and orderliness soon to be created.

It is quite possible, and it is altogether reasonable, that those private persons who are about to build may do so with a sense of patriotism and a willingness to contribute something to the good order of civic development. In the particular case of the United Cigar Stores Company it is felt that a properly designed building would enhance profits rather than impair them. There is a commercial and an advertising value in a good looking building; whereas an ill-designed and unfitting building is a detriment to the business it occupies.

The plans as submitted show that on both Pennsylvania Avenue and Fourteenth Street the structure on the lower floor is to extend three feet beyond the building line, thus occupying United States property to the extent of some 540 square feet. This space, it is understood, is occupied under a revokable permit issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as is customary, under the Building Code, in the case of show

All of these people feel--and have a right to feel--that the new building program, so long awaited, should have the encouragement and support of all private property owners, and that no obstacle should be erected out of harmony with the proposed development. Their right to such a feeling is based on the fact that it is the laws and the organizations of the Government which give commercial value to these tracts.

The location is one of the best situated of all the sites on the island. It will have an open exposure of light and is planned to be of such a nature that it will be a pleasure to visit. The most beautiful buildings for the most part are of the most beautiful materials and some of them are of the most beautiful materials. The other ones must soon give place to structures which will give pleasure to the eye. It is a matter of course that all new structures shall be in the line of the most beautiful and modern design to be erected.

The plans as submitted show that on both Pennsylvania Avenue and Connecticut Street the structure of the lower floor is to extend three feet beyond the building line, the occupying United States property to the extent of some 600 sq. ft. This space, it is understood, is occupied under a revocable permit issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, as is customary, under the Building Code, in the case of show

windows. This occupation of public property by show windows makes the designing of suitable frontage more difficult but not impossible. Such show windows seriously impair the orderly appearance of commercial streets

The Commission of Fine Arts regard the design submitted as radically and fundamentally unsuitable to the location; and that the building, if constructed according to present plans, will be a detriment to the appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue, both present and future.

In the event that the United Cigar Stores Company shall be disposed to meet the general views herein expressed, the Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8th, will be pleased to consider with the architect such modifications in the design as may be calculated to promote the ends sought. For the Commission of Fine Arts:

The United Cigar Stores Company, Very respectfully, yours,
New York, N. Y. Charles Moore,
Chairman."

The Commission said there was nothing in the letter that could be considered insulting, and that it was important that the right kind of a building be built at this location.

The secretary then informed Mr. Mitchell that the United States Government was appropriating millions of dollars for new Government buildings ~~xxx~~ in this vicinity, on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue; also that the Shipstead Bill, which contemplates giving the Commission of Fine Arts control over private buildings adjacent to public buildings and parks passed the United States Senate in ten days' time last February, and would unquestionably have passed the House of Representatives had not the adjournment on March 4th prevented; also that at this very meeting of the Commission the Public Buildings Commission is asking the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts as to the appropriate type of commercial building for the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, which is the most important Avenue of the country, being at the heart of the Nation.

Mr. Vitale called Mr. Mitchell's attention to a similar situation in New York City, when the Childs Restaurant Company planned to build one of their ordinary store buildings on Fifth Avenue; but that after protest by the Fifth Avenue Association it was decided to build a beautiful building at that location, and the Company has been much pleased over it ever since.

Mr. Mitchell said he felt his Company had reason to object to erecting a fine building at this location, as it is leased ground, for a period of 25 years, after which the land and store revert to the owners, and the Company pays the taxes. He regarded the grade a handicap in designing the building, there being a difference of 9 feet from E Street North. He said that steel for the building has been ordered, and that the contractor was ready to begin with his work. However, Mr. Mitchell said, he would be glad to consider changes in the design if he could find out what the Commission wanted done in the matter.

Thereupon the plans were inspected, particularly by the architect members of the Commission. The plans were criticized in the following particulars:

1. The cornice, which should be much simplified;
2. The complication of levels of the projecting bay windows;

Windows. This location of public property of the windows makes the designing of suitable frontage more difficult but not impossible. Such show windows naturally require the orderly appearance of commercial streets.

The Commission of the Arts in the matter of the design submitted as a preliminary and fundamentally unsatisfactory to the location; and that the building, as constructed according to present plans, will be a detriment to the appearance of Pennsylvania Avenue, both present and future.

In the event that a United States Stores Company shall be disposed to meet the General Plans herein expressed, the Commission of the Arts, at their meeting on December 28th, will be pleased to consider with the architect such modifications in the design as may be calculated to promote the ends sought.

Very respectfully,
Yours,
Charles Moore,
The United States Stores Company,
New York, N. Y.

The Commission said there was nothing in the latter that could be considered invidious, and that it was important that the right kind of a building be built at this location.

The secretary then informed Mr. Mitchell that the United States Government was appropriating millions of dollars for new Government buildings in this vicinity, on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue; also that the proposed Bill, which contemplates giving the Commission of the Arts control over private buildings adjacent to public buildings and parks passed the United States Senate in ten days' time last February, and would unquestionably have passed the House of Representatives had not the adjournment on March 4th prevented; also that at this very meeting of the Commission the Public Buildings Commission is asking the advice of the Commission of the Arts as to the appropriate type of commercial building for the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, which is the most important Avenue of the country, being at the heart of the Nation.

Mr. Vile called Mr. Mitchell's attention to a similar situation in New York City, when the United States Restaurant Company planned to build one of their ordinary store buildings on Fifth Avenue; but that after protest by the Fifth Avenue Association it was decided to build a beautiful building at that location, and the Company has been much pleased over it ever since.

Mr. Mitchell said he felt his Company had reason to object to erecting a fine building at this location, as it is leased ground, for a period of 25 years, after which the land and store revert to the owners, and the Company pays the taxes. He regarded the grade a handicap in designing the building, there being a difference of 3 feet from 11th Street North. He said that steel for the building has been ordered, and that the contractor was ready to begin with his work. However, Mr. Mitchell said, he would be glad to consider changes in the design if he could find out what the Commission wanted done in the matter.

Thereupon the plans were inspected, particularly by the architect members of the Commission. The plans were criticized in the following particulars:

1. The cornice, which should be much simplified;
2. The complication of levels of the projecting bay windows;

3. The treatment of the bay where the entrance occurs on the 14th Street side;
4. The complication of the use of combined face brick and stone on the comparatively small area of piers and walls;
5. The small and widely separated and unrelated ornaments at the top of the building. A level line of lintel was recommended.
6. The projecting pier at the corner occurring in the height of the second story and floating in the air without visible means of support.

The Commission objected particularly to the show windows projecting out on the sidewalk. Mr. Moore said the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia had called his attention to them a few days ago and that he suggested placing restrictions on the use of them. Mr. Mitchell said the Press Club building and the new Washington building as such projecting show windows, and he was therefore asking the same privileges for his Company, as they were needed for display purposes. The Commission said the Press Club and the Washington building (at 15th Street and New York Avenue) are high buildings, whereas this is to be simply a 40 foot building; but that projecting show windows are objectionable in all buildings, and that indications are they will be omitted from future commercial buildings on Pennsylvania, as they are built under a revokable permit issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Morris suggested that the United Cigar Stores Company make an exception in this case and not consider the question of profits primarily, but erect the proper kind of building at this important location adjacent to Pennsylvania Avenue; that not to do so was in his opinion missing an opportunity; that the building will have a conspicuous place through the years where millions of persons will see it.

Mr. Morris thereupon offered to consider with Mr. Mitchell a new study of the design, and by a new elevation show graphically how the building could be improved. Mr. Moore appointed Mr. Morris a Committee of one in this matter with power to act. Mr. Morris then arranged with Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Wenig for the preparation of a new study, to be submitted to his (Mr. Morris's office) for consideration.

(Mr. Morris, after consultation with Mr. Mitchell and the submission of a revised design, approved it. The design was approved officially by the Commission of Fine Arts on December 16, 1927, and a report sent on that date to Mr. Mitchell (Exhibit A). A copy thereof was sent to Mr. Wenig, who was much pleased with the result.

3. MUNICIPAL CENTER: Major L. E. Atkins, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and Mr. A. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, submitted plans for the Municipal Center proposed for erection on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, between Third and Sixth Streets, N.W. The ground plan showed also the square between 6th and 7th Streets, which the Commission of Fine Arts had recommended be included in the project as a park area. The plans showed that to the east of Third Street the project joins the plan for the development of the Capitol Grounds and Union Station Plaza, with an Avenue directly northeast from Third Street and Pennsylvania Avenue to the Union Station; so that these projects provide also for the proper development of the north side of Pennsylvania Ave. from the Capitol to Seventh Street.

3. The treatment of the bay where the entrance occurs on the left side;
4. The construction of the use of combined face brick and stone on the comparatively small area of piers and walls;
5. The wall on which the piers are situated and which is recommended to be built on a level line of level and recommended;
6. The projecting pier at the corner occurring in the height of the second story and rising in the air without visible means of support.

The Commission objected particularly to the new windows projecting out on the sidewalk. Mr. Moore said the Engineer Commission of the District of Columbia had called his attention to them a few days ago and that he suggested placing restrictions on the use of them. Mr. Mitchell said the Press Club building and the new Washington building as well as projecting windows, and he was therefore asking the same privileges for his Company, as they were needed for display purposes. The Commission said the Press Club and the Washington building (at 15th Street and New York Avenue) are high buildings, whereas this is to be a simply a 40 foot building; but that projecting windows are objectionable in all buildings, and that indications are they will be omitted from future commercial buildings on Pennsylvania, as they are built under a revocable permit issued by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia.

Mr. Morris suggested that the United States Company make an exception in this case and not consider the question of profile trimmings, but erect the proper kind of building at this important location adjacent to Pennsylvania Avenue; that not to do so was in his opinion missing an opportunity that the building will have a conspicuous place through the years where millions of persons will see it.

Mr. Morris thereupon offered to consider with Mr. Mitchell a new study of the design, and of a new elevation showing graphically how the building could be improved. Mr. Moore appointed Mr. Morris a Committee of one in this matter with power to act. Mr. Morris then arranged with Mr. Mitchell and Mr. Wenzel for the preparation of a new study, to be submitted to him (Mr. Morris's office) for consideration.

(Mr. Morris, after consultation with Mr. Mitchell and the Commission of a revised design, approved it. The design was approved October 11th by the Commission of the District of Columbia, and a report sent on that date to Mr. Mitchell (Chairman). A copy thereof was sent to Mr. Wenzel, who was then placed with the result.

3. MUNICIPAL COMMISSION: Mayor H. W. Blair, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, and Mr. A. A. Morris, Municipal Architect, submitted plans for the Municipal Center proposed for location on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, between Third and Sixth Streets, N.W. The ground plan showed the square between 6th and 7th Streets, which the Commission of the District had recommended be included in the project as a park area. The plan showed that to the east of Third Street the project joins the plan for the development of the Capital Grounds and Union Station Plaza, with an Avenue directly northeast from Third Street and Pennsylvania Avenue to the Union Station; so that these projects provide also for the proper development of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue from the Capital to Seventh Street.

The Municipal Center project provides for monumental buildings, of the classical order, adjacent to John Marshall Place, and extending from Pennsylvania Avenue northward to the District Supreme Court Building at Louisiana and Indiana Avenues. In this stretch of two squares along John Marshall Place there is a difference in grade of 30 feet. The plan provides for the treatment of John Marshall Place as a great open court; whether or not there will be a monumental entrance or "gateway" to the Court from Pennsylvania Avenue, as suggested in the plan, was left for future determination. The plan provides for a Municipal Building on Pennsylvania Avenue east of John Marshall Place; to the north of it will be a square for future expansion. To the west of John Marshall Place will be the Police Court, Municipal Court, Recorder of Deeds, and Police Headquarters Buildings. The first Unit is to be built at Louisiana Avenue and John Marshall Place, where, Major Atkins said, the District Government now owns some land, opposite Judiciary Square.

The plan was approved generally (Exhibit B), and regarded a project worthy of being recommended to Congress for adoption. Major Atkins said the District Commissioners propose to secure the necessary authorization Act for the project at this session of Congress. He said it is estimated that it will cost from 25 to 40 millions of dollars, and is to provide for the needs of the District Government for 40 years. It will make possible the housing also of District activities that are now in rented quarters.

Two schemes, one showing a tower and the other a circular court, were presented, but these features were not favored.

4. SIXTEENTH STREET FIRE STATION: Mr. Harris submitted a design for the proposed Fire Engine House to be erected at Sixteenth and Webster Streets, a Georgian type of building. The design was approved with the suggestion that the mass of the piers be reduced; that the drum under the column of the tower be raised; that the mass of the cornice be reduced.

The Commission also urged that another side than Sixteenth Street be selected for the Fire Engine House, as it is one of the most important thoroughfares of the National Capital, devoted particularly to embassies, churches and institutions (Exhibit C).

5. BRIGHTWOOD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Harris submitted a design for the Brightwood Junior High School, which was approved.

6. POTOMAC HEIGHTS SCHOOL: Mr. Harris resubmitted the design for the Potomac Heights Graded School. The design was approved with the suggestion that the brick work be raised a trifle.

7. BRICK FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS: Major L. E. Atkins, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, submitted the following Memorandum, requesting advice as to the use of hydraulic-pressed brick for school buildings of the District:

"The Engineer Commissioner of the District requests that, if possible, I obtain a statement from the Fine Arts Commission concerning the

The Municipal Center project provides for monumental buildings, of the classical order, adjacent to John Marshall Place, and extending from Pennsylvania Avenue northward to the District Supreme Court Building at Louisiana and Indiana Avenues. In this stretch of two squares along John Marshall Place there is a difference in grade of 30 feet. The plan provides for the treatment of John Marshall Place as a great open court; whether or not there will be a monumental entrance or "gateway" to the Court from Pennsylvania Avenue, as suggested in the plan, was left for future determination. The plan provides for a Municipal Building on Pennsylvania Avenue east of John Marshall Place; to the north of it will be a square for future extension. To the west of John Marshall Place will be the Police Court, Municipal Court, Recorder of Deeds, and Police Headquarters buildings. The first unit is to be built at Louisiana Avenue and John Marshall Place, where, Mayor Atkins said, the District Government now owns some land, opposite Judiciary Square.

The plan was approved generally (Exhibit B), and regarded a project worthy of being recommended to Congress for adoption. Mayor Atkins said the District Commissioners propose to secure the necessary authorization for the project at this session of Congress. He said it is estimated that it will cost from \$5 to \$6 millions of dollars, and is to provide for the needs of the District Government for 40 years. It will make possible the housing also of District activities that are now in rented quarters.

Two schemes, one showing a tower and the other a circular court, were presented, but these features were not favored.

4. TWENTY-THIRD STREET HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Harris submitted a design for the proposed Fine Engine House to be erected at Thirtieth and Webster Streets, a Georgian type of building. The design was approved with the suggestion that the mass of the plans be reduced; that the gable under the column of the tower be raised; that the mass of the cornice be reduced.

The Commission also urged that another site than Thirtieth Street be selected for the Fine Engine House, as it is one of the most important thoroughfares of the National Capital, devoted particularly to embassies, churches and institutions (Exhibit C).

5. BRIGHTWOOD JUNIOR HIGH SCHOOL: Mr. Harris submitted a design for the Brightwood Junior High School, which was approved.

6. POTOMAC HEIGHTS GRADUATE SCHOOL: Mr. Harris resubmitted the design for the Potomac Heights Graduate School. The design was approved with the suggestion that the brick work be raised a trifle.

7. BUILDING FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA SCHOOLS: Mayor M. E. Atkins, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia, submitted the following memorandum, requesting advice as to the use of brickwork in school buildings of the District:

"The Engineer Commissioner of the District requests that, if possible, I obtain a statement from the Arts Commission concerning the

proper kind of face brick for buildings constructed by the District of Columbia. Most specifically, he requests that the answers be obtained to the two questions listed below.

1. Can the so-called hydraulic-pressed brick properly be classified as a Colonial Brick?
2. If furnished with a sanded surface would the hydraulic-pressed brick be a satisfactory brick from an architectural standpoint for use in a building of Colonial design?

Mr. Harris said the hydraulic-pressed brick was being offered to Washington for \$35 M, against \$26 M in Baltimore, where it is made; seconds at \$18 to \$19 M; he felt that ~~what~~ is called "colonial brick" is much better, since it is made in the customary way of making bricks and is available at the same price; whereas hydraulic-pressed brick is made under pressure four bricks at a time. In his opinion there is a great difference in the appearance of the two kinds of brick. Mr. Harris submitted samples of brick as follows: 1, M.S. Colonial; 2, Mankin Colonial; 3, Reed Colonial; 4, Homewood Colonial; 5, Booker Colonial.

It was decided to inspect the samples of brick at the ~~Gordon Junior~~ ^{Garnett-Patterson} High School, at 10th and U Streets, N.W., which was done. The Commission noted a striking difference in the hydraulic-pressed brick from that which is called "colonial brick"; that the hydraulic-pressed brick has an artificial appearance, and in their opinion a sanded surface did not improve it any (Exhibit D).

8. CONTINENTAL OFFICE BUILDING, 14th and K Streets, N.W.: The secretary read the following letter dated December 7, 1927, from Mr. Bates Warren, of this city, regarding a design for a new office building at 14th and K Streets, N.W., and concerning which advice was requested, as follows:

"I have just completed arrangements, together with several associates, for the erection of a large Office Building on the northwest corner of Fourteenth and K Streets, N.W., on the present side of the Franklin Square Hotel. This building will front 125 feet on Fourteenth Street by a depth of 96 feet on K Street, and will contain approximately 1,500,000 cubic feet. The zoning height at this location is 110 feet, and under recent ruling of the Zoning Commission, we are permitted to go to a height of 130 feet by recessing the stories above the 110 foot level.

In order to make the building as ornamental and pleasing in architectural features as possible, Mr. Robert F. Beresford, the Architect, has located the elevators and the smokestack in the center of the building so as to incorporate them in a pent house, which he has treated with a tower effect. In order to accommodate the machinery of the elevators, which are to be of the latest type high speed elevators, the Otis Elevator Company has submitted designs showing the minimum head-room required for the overhead machinery, which has been indicated on the drawing of our building.

At the suggestion of Mr. Beresford, we are submitted herewith the tentative studies of the elevations with the idea that we would welcome any criticisms or suggestions from you in regard to our treatment of the superstructure above the height of the office floors.

It is our idea to make this building as monumental in character

proper kind of floor which for building constructed by the District of Columbia, but especially, he requests that the answers be obtained to the two questions listed below.

1. Can the so-called hydraulic-pressed brick properly be

classified as a Colonial brick?

2. If classified as a Colonial brick, would the hydraulic-

pressed brick be a satisfactory brick from an architectural standpoint for use in a building of Colonial design?

Mr. Harris said the hydraulic-pressed brick was being offered to Washington for \$3.00, against \$5.00 in Baltimore, where it is made; whereas at \$1.00 to \$1.25 he felt that what is called "Colonial brick" is much better, since it is made in the country, of native bricks and is available at the same price; whereas hydraulic-pressed brick is made under pressure four times at a time. In his opinion there is a great difference in the appearance of the two kinds of brick. Mr. Harris submitted samples of brick as follows: 1, Colonial; 2, Baltimore Colonial; 3, Head Colonial; 4, Homewood Colonial; 5, Boston Colonial.

It was decided to inspect the samples of brick at the Garden Junior High School, at 10th and E Streets, N.W., which was done. The Commission noted a striking difference in the hydraulic-pressed brick from that which is called "Colonial brick"; that the hydraulic-pressed brick has an artificial appearance, and in their opinion a second choice did not improve it any (Exhibit B).

3. COMMISSIONER OF PUBLIC WORKS, 14th and E Streets, N.W.: The secretary read the following letter dated December 1, 1934, from Mr. Bates, Mayor, of this city, regarding a design for a new office building at 14th and E Streets, N.W., and concerning which advice was requested, as follows:

"I have just completed arrangements, together with several associates, for the erection of a large office building on the northwest corner of Fourteenth and E Streets, N.W., on the present site of the Franklin Square Hotel. This building will front the lot on Fourteenth Street by a depth of 98 feet on E Street, and will contain approximately 1,500,000 cubic feet. The building height at this location is 110 feet, and under recent ruling of the zoning Commission, we are permitted to go to a height of 100 feet by recessing the stories above the 110 foot level.

In order to make the building as ornamental and pleasing in architectural features as possible, Mr. Robert A. Berensford, the architect, has located the elevators and the entrance in the center of the building so as to incorporate them in a vent hood, which is treated with a tower effect. In order to accommodate the machinery of the elevators, and also to be of the latest type high speed elevators, the Otto Elevator Company has submitted designs showing the minimum head-room required for the overhead machinery, which has been indicated on the drawing of our building.

At the suggestion of Mr. Berensford, we are submitted herewith the tentative studies of the elevators with the idea that we would welcome any criticism or suggestions from you in regard to our treatment of the elevators above the height of the office floors. It is our idea to make this building as monumental in character

as possible, and with that object in mind, we have not spared any expense in the design. Your early consideration of these studies will be very much appreciated."

Mr. Beresford, Architect, submitted the design with a model illustrating the particular question raised as to the treatment of a tower in the center of the building to meet elevator requirements (which is to ascend at the rate of 450 feet a minute).

The architect members of the Commission inspected the design, and upon their recommendation it was approved, with the suggestion that the tower be increased both in height and in width. Mr. Beresford said the building would be constructed of limestone and terra cotta, which the Commission regarded acceptable (Exhibit E). Mr. Beresford's attention was called to certain features as to the treatment of the interior, which he said he would keep in mind in the further development of the project.

9. SEVILLE INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION BUILDING: Hon. Thomas E. Campbell, Commissioner General of the Seville International Exposition Commission, in company with Mr. John M. Denison, Secretary, submitted a revised plan prepared by Mr. Wm. Templeton Johnson, Architect, for the permanent exposition building of the United States Government at Seville. The building is to be triangular to fit the triangular plot of ground that has been leased by the Government (about 28,000 square feet), since it was found that not enough land for a square-shaped building, as heretofore contemplated, could be secured. Mr. Johnson explained the plans as they were inspected by the Commission. His home being at San Diego, the plans suggested a Spanish-American type of building of that locality.

The members of the Commission were well pleased with the plans and approved them; also the plans for the temporary exposition building and for the moving picture house were approved (Exhibit F).

10. HOSPICE FOR MONTFAUCON: Under date of December 8, 1927, the following letter was received from the American Battle Monuments Commission, requesting advice as to a design for a Hospice and Memorial of the 37th Battle Monuments Commission of the State of Ohio, to be erected at Montfaucon, France:

"The Act creating the American Battle Monuments Commission provides that before any design or material for memorials is accepted by the Commission, the same shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts. In accordance with this act, I have the honor to transmit herewith, for your consideration, a drawing of a Hospice and Memorial to be erected by the 37th Division Battle Monument Commission in the new town of Montfaucon, together with a statement of the architect, Mr. Robert R. Reeves, in regard thereto.

The Commission would appreciate having your freest comments in regard to the enclosed design."

The Commission were well pleased with the design and approved it (Exhibit G)

11. FORT HUMPHREYS, LANDSCAPE PLAN: The Commission considered with Captain John E. Wood, of Fort Humphreys, Virginia, further landscape plans for the

as possible, and with least effect in mind, to have not turned any expense in the design. Your early consideration of these studies will be very much appreciated.

Mr. Boardman, architect, submitted the design for a building to the particular attention of the President of the Board in the center of the building to meet elevator requirements (which is to ascend at the rate of 150 feet a minute). The architect members of the Commission inspected the design, and upon their recommendation it was approved, with the suggestion that the tower be increased both in height and in width. Mr. Boardman said the building would be constructed of limestone and terra cotta, which the Commission reported acceptable (Exhibit B). Mr. Boardman's attention was called to certain features as to the treatment of the interior, which he said he would keep in mind in the further development of the project.

2. REVISED INTERNATIONAL EXPOSITION BUILDING: Mr. Boardman, architect, in Commission General of the design International Exposition Building, in company with Mr. Boardman, architect, submitted a revised plan prepared by Mr. Boardman, architect, for the permanent exhibition building of the United States Government at Seattle. The building is to be triangular to fit the triangular plot of ground that has been leased by the Government (about 20,000 square feet), since it was found that not enough land for a square-shaped building, as previously contemplated, could be secured. Mr. Boardman explained the plan as they were inspected by the Commission. His name being at the design, the plan suggested a Spanish-American type of building of that locality.

The members of the Commission were well pleased with the plans and approved them; also the plans for the temporary exhibition building and for the moving picture house were approved (Exhibit C).

10. DESIGN FOR MOUNTAIN HOUSE: Under date of December 6, 1907, the following letter was received from the American Battle Monuments Commission, requesting advice as to a design for a house and hospital at the 57th Battle Monument Commission of the State of Ohio, to be erected at Washington, France:

"We are not creating the American Battle Monuments Commission provides that before any design or material for a building is accepted by the Commission, the same shall be approved by the National Commission of Fine Arts. In accordance with this act, I have the honor to transmit herewith, for your consideration, a drawing of a house and hospital to be erected by the 57th Division Battle Monument Commission in the new town of Fontenay, together with a statement of the architect, Mr. Robert A. Hovey, in regard thereto. The Commission would appreciate having your expert comments in regard to the enclosed design."

The Commission were well pleased with the design and approved it (Exhibit C)

11. FORT MONTEVIDEO, ARGENTINA: The Commission considered with certain John A. Wood, of Fort Montevideo, Argentina, further landscape plans for the

development of the grounds at this army post. These plans for the most part carried out recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 14th and referred particularly to the Non-Commissioned Officers Quarters area, the Regimental Parade; Circulation Center, the Artificial Lake, and Sign Posts and Direction Signs; also the Plan for the layout of the roads.

The plans were approved generally, and a report was sent to Col. E. M. Markham, Commandant of Fort Humphreys (Exhibit H).

12. **FIRST DIVISION MEMORIAL:** Under date of November 15, 1927, Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, submitted a design for the landscape treatment of the First Division Memorial, with letter, as follows:

"The site of the First Division Monument in its present shape has given me some anxiety, and I feel that it is very desirable to make any changes that are to be made as soon as possible, as each year that the trees grow older, the difficulty of moving them without injury increases.

General King seems to think that the First Division Monument Association could contribute between one and two thousand dollars for this work. Enclosed is a blueprint showing rectification in grades which will eliminate the steep slope on the south side of the Monument terrace, which slope because of its inability to hold any moisture and its exposure to almost direct sunlight during the greater part of the day in summer is always in bad condition and makes a brown streak across the lawn. It would be very much appreciated if the Commission of Fine Arts would consider the grading plan suggested in the accompanying blueprint and advise me as to its approval or any modification that may be necessary."

The plan was given particular attention by Mr. Vitale, who regarded it satisfactory. It is understood that several existing trees south of the monument (about 6 or 8, each about 6 inches in diameter) will have to be raised, as it is proposed to regrade the grounds south to B Street, as part of the cross axis of the Mall, according to the Plan of 1901. It was thought a tree could be replanted for about \$40. Attention was called to Mr. Cass Gilbert's scheme (architect of the memorial) for an oblong terraced treatment with fountains).

Mr. Moore said before taking final action in the matter he thought it desirable to speak with Major General Summerall about it, who commanded the First Division, A. E. F., and was President of the First Division Memorial Association at the time the First Division Monument was erected.

13. **STATUE OF SERENITY:** Lieut. Col. Grant submitted a landscape plan for the Statue of Serenity in Meridian Hill Park, with letter dated November 25, 1927, as follows:

"In reply to your note of July 21, I submit a sketch which Mr. Payne has prepared for new planting around the statue of Serenity on the west side of Meridian Hill Park. I have held this sometime, to see whether we would be likely to have the necessary funds this autumn. It does not appear now that the work proposed could be done, even if

development of the grounds at this army post. These plans for the most part carried out recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 14th and referred particularly to the Non-Commissioned Officers' quarters area, the Regimental Parade, Circulation Center, the official lake, and sign posts, and Direction signs; also the plan for the layout of the roads.

The plans were approved generally, and a report was sent to Col. H. M. Latham, Commandant of Fort Humphreys (Exhibit H).

12. FIRST DIVISION MEMORIAL: Under date of November 10, 1937, Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 2d, Director of Public Buildings and Public Parks of the National Capital, submitted a design for the landscape treatment of the First Division Memorial, with letter, as follows:

"The site of the First Division Memorial in its present shape has given me some anxiety, and I feel that it is very desirable to make any changes that are to be made as soon as possible, as each year that the trees grow older, the difficulty of moving them without injury increases.

General King seems to think that the First Division Memorial Association could contribute between one and two thousand dollars for this work. Enclosed is a blueprint showing reclamation in grades which will eliminate the steep slope on the south side of the Monument terrace, which also because of its inability to hold any moisture and its exposure to almost direct sunlight during the greater part of the day in summer is always in bad condition and makes a brown streak across the lawn. It would be very much appreciated if the Association of Fine Arts would consider the grading plan suggested in the accompanying blueprint and advise me as to its approval or any modification that may be necessary."

The plan was given particular attention by Mr. Vialle, who reported it satisfactory. It is understood that several existing trees south of the monument (about 5 or 6, each about 8 inches in diameter) will have to be raised, as it is proposed to regrade the grounds north to B Street, as part of the cross axis of the Mall, according to the plan of 1934. It was thought a tree could be replanted for about \$40. Attention was called to Mr. U. S. Grant's scheme (architect of the memorial) for an oblong terrace treatment with fountain.

Mr. Moore said before taking final action in the matter he thought it desirable to speak with Major General Sumner II about it, who commanded the First Division, 1917-19, and was President of the First Division Memorial Association at the time the First Division Monument was erected.

13. STATUE OF GORNETT: Lieut. Col. Grant submitted a landscape plan for the Statue of Gornett in Sheridan Hill Park, with letter dated November 23, 1937, as follows:

"In reply to your note of July 21, I submit a sketch which Mr. Payne has prepared for new planting around the statue of Gornett on the west side of Sheridan Hill Park. I have held this sometime, to see whether we would be likely to have the necessary funds this autumn. It does not appear now that the work proposed could be done, even if

approved by the Commission of Fine Arts. However, it might be well to have your Commission's views on the subject and something that could be called an approved project, so that it can be done whenever opportunity offers.

The sketch is, therefore, submitted to you with a request that I be given the advantage of your Commission's suggestions in the matter, and your views as to whether it is really worth while spending even \$250 or so on doing anything of the sort."

The plan was given particularly attention by Mr. Vitale, who approved the plan, with the suggestion that the planting be massed back of the memorial, and omitting the berberry bushes in front of it. He said the planting suggested by Mr. Payne, as the vines, Japanese Quince, and berberry is such as will grow considerably in the course of two or three years, and give a good landscape setting for the statue. The Commission endorsed Mr. Vitale's recommendations. (Exhibit I)

In this connection Mr. Vitale called attention to the model of Mr. Paulanship for a "Meridian Sphere", which has been on exhibition recently at the Century Club. The Commission agreed with Mr. Vitale that this would be appropriate for Meridian Hill Park and a fine work of art, several of the members having seen the model.

14. PLAN FOR THE MALL: The Commission called the attention of Col. Grant to the importance of undertaking further work on the Mall roads from the Capitol to the Washington Monument. It was pointed out that traffic congestion will arise by the closing of streets in the Triangle, during the construction of public buildings, and additional roadways should be provided in the Mall to help avoid this. A part of the roads have been built, especially between Third and Four-and-a-half Streets, and adjacent to the Temporary War Buildings in the Mall, which are to be removed in the near future. The fact was emphasized that the Mall Plan is one of the great features of the L'Enfant Plan, and if work for completion of the roads could be authorized at this session of Congress, the Mall would be practically complete by 1932. It was pointed out that there are several public buildings on the Mall that have been built to conform to the Mall Plan, and a through road from the Capitol to the Washington Monument, leading in front of these buildings, on both the north side and the south side of the Mall, parallel to B Street North and B Street South is urgently needed. Dirt from the excavations of the new public buildings could be used in grading the Mall.

Attention was also called to the desirability of replanting and trimming some of the shrubbery on the Mall.

15. PENNSYLVANIA RAILROAD BRIDGE, WATER STREET: Mr. J. G. Hopkins, Division Engineer of the Pennsylvania Railroad, Baltimore, in company with Mr. Fred McKenney, attorney of the railroad, appeared before the Commission with a sketch for the proposed railroad bridge of the company at the head of Water Street in this city, which is to give them additional siding, which they said is very much needed. The sketch had particular reference to the treatment of the panels, as an agreement had heretofore been reached as to the general type and length of the bridge. Three types of panels were suggested by the sketch,--rivets exposed, rivets covered, panel welded to the girder.

The architect members of the Commission suggested a modification of the panel, to show about an 18 inch base board, and a 12 inch border at the top, with

a 4' x 2' panel in the center of the girder.

Also, a restudy of the masonry buttress, and about a four-inch lattice work for the supporting columns was recommended to give it more stability.

(Mr. Hopkins submitted a revised design carrying out these recommendations which was submitted to Mr. Mooris, who recommended its approval, and it was thereupon approved by the Commission{ Exhibits J and J-1}).

16. SAULT STE MARIE LANDSCAPE PLAN: The secretary reported that the Chief of Engineers had submitted a request, dated October 13, 1927, from Col. Spencer Cosby, Division Engineer, Lakes Division, Cleveland, that the Commission of Fine Arts advise as to a landscape plan for the Government Reservation at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, and that Mr. Moore had suggested in behalf of the Commission, by letter of October 20, 1927, that a general landscape plan of the area be made (Exhibit K).

17. WAKEFIELD: Mrs. H. L. Rust, President of the Wakefield National Memorial Association, appeared before the Commission in company with Mr. Edward W. Donn, Jr., Architect, and submitted a design made by him for the birthplace of George Washington at Wakefield. Mrs. Rust also submitted a pamphlet regarding Wakefield, which she said had just come from the printer, describing Wakefield (Exhibit L).

Mr. Moore, Vice President of the Association, explained that Wakefield is about 60 miles south of Washington (air line),-by way of Fredericksburg about 100 miles, and is along the banks of the Potomac. The original house was destroyed by fire, but the Government has a reservation of 11.88 acres, with a monument to mark the site at Popes Creek. The Wakefield Memorial Association has bought 70 acres of the old Washington lands, including the right of Way 50 feet wide from the old graveyard, in which 4 to 6 generations of Washingtons are buried, to the main road. The graveyard, which is owned by the State of Virginia, is a mile away, around the bend of the river at Bridges Creek, to which Washington generally referred as being his birthplace, and where the Government some years ago constructed a wharf, which has been destroyed by ice.

Mr. Moore said the Wakefield Memorial Association is anxious to carry out its project by 1932, the Bicentennial of the Birthday of George Washington, and in its work is proceeding in accordance with the Act of Congress approved June 7, 1926, which provides that the Association may erect "a replica, as nearly as may be practicable, of the house in which George Washington was born"--and "that the plans--shall receive the approval of the Fine Arts Commission and the Secretary of War--" (Exhibit L-1).

Mrs. Rust said that the 70 acres are paid for, that they have no overhead expenses, pay no salaries, and have today about \$12,000 in the bank; that they expect to raise at least \$30,000 for the Washington house, for the caretaker's house, and for the landscape treatment of the grounds. Mrs. Rust stated that Mr. Donn's plans meet with the approval of the Wakefield National Memorial Association; that Mr. Donn prepared them after careful study of the architecture of George Washington's time, and in comparison with mansions of colonial days, and that the design, which is shown in the pamphlet, is in their opinion the type of house that stood at Wakefield when George Washington was born. Mrs. Rust then said there are interesting details in connection with the plans which

A 1' x 1' panel in the center of the floor.
Also, a variety of the heavy buttress, and about a foot-high lattice
work for the supporting columns was recommended to give it more stability.

(Mr. Hopkins submitted a revised design of the building and these recommendations
which was submitted to Mr. Moore, who recommended its approval, and it was
thereupon approved by the Commission (Exhibits 1 and 2-1).)

13. Mr. Moore's letter to Mr. Hopkins dated October 11, 1935, from
Chief of Engineers had submitted a report, dated October 11, 1935, from
Col. Thomas Gandy, Division Engineer, Division of Reclamation, that the
Commission of Fine Arts advise as to a landscape plan for the Government
Reservation at Smith Lake, Idaho, and that Mr. Moore had suggested
in behalf of the Commission, by letter of October 10, 1935, that a General
Landscape plan of the area be made (Exhibit 3).

14. Mr. Moore, President of the National
Memorial Association, advised before the Commission in company with Mr. Edward
W. Dunn, Jr., architect, and submitted a design made by him for the design
of George Washington Memorial. Mr. Dunn also submitted a plan
regarding the site, which was also submitted to the Commission, describing
the site (Exhibit 4).

15. Mr. Moore, Vice President of the Association, explained that the site
is about 60 miles south of Washington (Exhibit 5). The site of the building
100 miles, and is about the same as the site of the building. The building
destroyed by fire, but the Government had a reservation of 11,000 acres, with
a monument to mark the site of the building. The National Memorial Association
had bought 75 acres of the old Washington land, including the right of way
30 feet wide from the old highway, in which A to 6 reservations of
the building, to the main road. The Government, which is owned by the State of
Idaho, is a mile long, and the band of the river at Smith Lake, to
which Washington General had been assigned as being his birthplace, and where the
Government some years ago constructed a dam, which has been destroyed by ice.

16. Mr. Moore said the National Memorial Association is anxious to carry out
its project by 1938, the bicentennial of the birth of George Washington, and
in its work is proceeding in accordance with the act of Congress approved
June 7, 1936, which provides that the Association may erect a replica, as
nearly as may be practicable, of the house in which George Washington was
born, and that the plan shall receive the approval of the line and
Commission and the Secretary of War (Exhibit 6-1).

17. Mr. Moore said that the 75 acres are paid for, that they have no overlaid
except, say no building, and have been about 11,000 in the hands of the
exact to raise at least \$50,000 for the building house, for the estate's
house, and for the landscape treatment of the grounds. Mr. Moore stated
that Mr. Dunn's plan met with the approval of the National Memorial
Association; that Mr. Dunn prepared a plan after careful study of the site and
of George Washington's time, and in accordance with the wishes of the National
Association, which is shown in the map, in his opinion the
type of house that stood at Smith Lake when George Washington was born, and that
then said there are interesting details in connection with the plan which

she would like to have Mr. Donn explain.

Mr. Donn said: "I had very little to go by. The foundations of the building that was there are very fragmentary. They have done some probing round and digging, but it is more or less guess work. Washington himself had very little to say when asked several times about his birthplace; in fact I think his recollections were hazy. But in Lawson's book he said it was a modest mansion of four rooms, and in looking over descriptions of houses of that time I took it as they understood it, -4 rooms on the main floor. Speaking of a four-room house then referred to the real rooms in the house. They crept up and slept in the attic. The houses of that day were mostly one-story with an attic. It was not until the 'golden age' that Virginia went into two-story and three-story structures. The usual house of the early days of Virginia had a pitch of 50 degrees or 45 degrees; less than 45 degrees is unusual. There is not an exact record of the house and this design here is not a restoration. It is a composition of data I secured about the houses of the size in which George Washington was born. We know it was a brick house, and believe it measured about 35' x 60'. There are traces of foundations of a house at Wakefield, but we cannot say whether they accurately define the outlines of the house of Washington's time. We know that some of the brick in the house melted during a fire, and that the old place was abandoned for many years. In an area of 100 feet square, where digging has been done the foundations are fragmentary, so that I think a drawing to restore the place and show the foundations is an absurdity. The foundations are in fragmentary spots. The best thing to do is, I think, what we have done here--design a house of the period of George Washington's day. This house was not elaborate; it was a modest mansion--a manor house, as also a four-room house was understood to be. It was not a cabin; even a two-room house, such as the Thoroughgood House of 1634 at Norfolk was a mansion, as they then understood the term."

Mrs. Rust said the United States Engineers' Office, in their searches for foundations at Wakefield, discovered fragments of china ware; among them a very interesting old piece of sal glaze Lenox China from England, which she showed to the Commission. Mrs. Rust said she had this piece examined by an expert at the Trenton Pottery, who pronounced it genuine,--"that china was in no mean house". The Commission examined this piece of china with much interest. Mrs. Rust said if authority is given to proceed with the plans they propose using soil from Wakefield to give the bricks proper color of the house of colonial days.

Mrs. Rust then called attention to the general scheme of development proposed for Wakefield; that in addition to the house, which would be made a place of historic interest, like Mount Vernon, there would be the caretaker's house; rest room for visitors; the existing "funereal column" marking the birthplace would doubtless be moved to another location; the grounds given a fine landscape treatment and related to Bridges Creek. The Commission approved the plans submitted (Exhibit L-2).

18. LANDSCAPE PLAN FOR THE FREER GALLERY OF ART: Under date of November 29, 1927, the following letter was received from Mr. John E. Lodge, Curator of the Freer Gallery of Art, with a landscape plan for the Gallery, suggesting also the

the world like to have Mr. John explain.

Mr. John said: "I had very little to say. The foundations of the building that was there are very fragmentary. They have some good round and digging, but it is more or less guess work. Washington House is very little to say when asked about his building; in fact I think his recollections were many. But in Lewis's book he said it was a modest mansion of four rooms, and in looking over descriptions of houses of that time I took it as they understood it, a house of the main floor, consisting of a four-room house then referred to the 1 room in the house, they erect up and sleep in the attic. The number of that house was a two-story with an attic. It was not until the 'Golden Age' that Virginia went into two-story and three-story structures. The usual house of the early days of Virginia had a pitch of 30 degrees or 45 degrees; less than 15 degrees is unusual. There is not an exact record of the house and this building here is not a restoration. It is a reproduction of what I learned about the house at the time in which George Washington was born. As far as it was a brick house, and believe it measured about 35' x 30'. There are traces of round stone of a house at Kenilworth, but we cannot say whether they are really genuine or the outlines of the house of Washington's time. We know that some of the brick in the house melted during a fire, and that the old place was so burned for many years. In an area of 100 feet square, where digging has been done the foundations are fragmentary, so that I think a drawing to restore the place and show the foundations is an assembly. The foundations are in fragmentary spots. The best thing to do is, I think, what we have done here--design a house of the period of George Washington's day. This house was not elaborate; it was a modest mansion--a four-room house, as also a four-room house was understood to be. It was not a cabin; even a two-room house, such as the Longwood house of 1884 at Kenilworth was a mansion, as they then understood the term."

Mr. East said the United States Engineers' Office, in their researches for foundations at Kenilworth, discovered fragments of china, and found them a very interesting old piece of earl. James Taylor China from England, which she showed to the Commission. Mr. East said she had this piece examined by an expert at the Trenton Pottery, who pronounced it genuine. "That china was in no mean house," the Commission examined this piece of china with much interest. Mr. East said it is authority is given to proceed with the plan they propose using soil from Kenilworth to give the bricks proper color of the house of colonial days.

Mr. East then called attention to the general scheme of development proposed for Kenilworth; that in addition to the house, which would be made a place of historic interest, like Mount Vernon, there would be the caretaker's house; a rest room for visitors; the existing "Trenton" column, marking the site; places would doubtless be moved to another location; the grounds given a fine landscape treatment and related to bridges Creek. The Commission approved the plans submitted (Exhibit B-2).

18. A letter from the National Gallery of Art, under date of November 18, 1937, the following letter was received: "The National Gallery of Art, under date of Nov. 18, 1937, with a landscape plan for the gallery, as follows: The site

location of a fence around the Freer Gallery:

November 29, 1927.

"My dear Mr. Moore:

"Under separate cover I am sending you a blue print showing the location of the proposed fence around the Freer Gallery.

The position of the fence is indicated in red, and you will notice that since talking with you I have extended the enclosure as far eastward as is possible at present without crossing the building line, or encroaching on the back yard, so to speak, of the Smithsonian itself.

If it is your opinion that both the Fine Arts Commission and Colonel Grant will be likely to accept such a plan on general principles, I shall feel justified in asking Mr. Platt to submit details of the fence structure and of the planting which he has in mind for the enclosure. In this connection, let me add that of the trees shown on the plan I am sending you, the three at either corner of the front of the Gallery are proposed, all the others are now in existence.

Sincerely yours,

J. E. Lodge, Curator.

The Commission, after consideration, approved the plan. The Commission expressed the need of a landscape setting for the Gallery as is now proposed, and recommended that in connection with the work the grades in front of the building be made to conform to the grades as planned south of the main Mall road, including the planting of trees. The Commission felt that south of the service Mall road a garden could be developed for the display of works of art appropriate to a garden, and suggested that land east of the Gallery be included in the garden. (Exhibit M)

19. HAWAII SESQUICENTENNIAL COIN: Hon. Victor K. Houston, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, having asked the Commission of Fine Arts for advice as to a design for their proposed Hawaii Sesquicentennial half-dollar, the sketches he submitted for it were forwarded to Mr. Taft for his recommendation. These showed the head of Captain James Cook, for the obverse, and that of a Native of Hawaii, for the reverse. Mr. Taft regarded the sketches acceptable and suggested that Mr. Fraser be asked to select a sculptor here in the East who might be available, possibly in New York, for the work of making a model. (Exhibit N).

20. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE, Under-pass: The Commission were in conference with Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer, and Major J. C. Mehaffey, Assistant, of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, and with Mr. Wm. Mitchell Kendall of the firm of McKim, Mead and White, Architects of the bridge, as to a revised study for the treatment of the Underpass, according to a sketch submitted by Mr. Kendall.

Mr. Kendall said he still prefers the omission of the Underpass, but as both the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission regard it a necessity to separate north and south bound traffic from east and west bound, at the Lincoln Memorial, the architects acquiesce in the matter. However, instead of dividing the Water Gate steps, as had been considered at the joint meeting of these Commission on the subject last September, Mr. Kendall said he proposes to restore the steps to their original

November 22, 1907.

Location of a fence around the "Green Valley";

W. J. Goss; 1907.

Under separate cover I am sending you a plan showing the location of the proposed fence around the "Green Valley".

The position of the fence is indicated in red, and you will notice that since writing you I have extended the enclosure as far eastward as it possible at present without crossing the existing line, or encroaching on the land of the neighboring land.

It is your opinion that both the time and the Commission and General Grant will be likely to accept such a plan on the principles, I shall be satisfied in making it. I shall to submit details of the fence the course and of the planting which is in mind for the enclosure. In this connection, let me add that of the trees shown on the plan I am sending you, the three at either corner of the front of the valley are proposed, all the others are now in existence.

Sincerely yours,
W. J. Goss, Director.

The Commission, after consideration, approved the plan. The Commission expressed the wish of a landscape architect to be in possession of the plan and recommended that in connection with the work the garden in front of the building be made to conform to the plan as planned south of the main fall road, including the planting of trees. The Commission felt that south of the service hall road a garden could be developed for the display of work of art appropriate to a garden, and suggested that land east of the Gallery be included in the garden. (Exhibit B)

19. HAWAII AND THE UNITED STATES. Hon. Walter H. Henshaw, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, having asked the Commission of Fine Arts for advice as to a design for their proposed Hawaii Bicentennial half-dollar, the architect he suggested for it was forwarded to him. That for his recommendation these plans the land of Captain James Cook, for the observance, and that of a native of Hawaii, for the reverse. It was suggested that the architect responsible for the design be asked to select a monitor tower in the West and suggested that, if, under the name of a monitor tower, the architect might be available, possibly in New York, for the work of making a model. (Exhibit C)

20. HAWAIIAN MONUMENT. Hon. Walter H. Henshaw, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, having asked the Commission of Fine Arts for advice as to a design for their proposed Hawaii Bicentennial half-dollar, the architect he suggested for it was forwarded to him. That for his recommendation these plans the land of Captain James Cook, for the observance, and that of a native of Hawaii, for the reverse. It was suggested that the architect responsible for the design be asked to select a monitor tower in the West and suggested that, if, under the name of a monitor tower, the architect might be available, possibly in New York, for the work of making a model. (Exhibit C)

Mr. Randall said he still prefers the mission of the monument, and as both the Commission of Fine Arts and the National Capital Park and Planning Commission regard it a necessity to separate north and south bound traffic from east and west bound, at the Lincoln Memorial, the architect responsible in the matter. However, instead of dividing the Water Gate steps, as had been considered at the joint meeting of these Commission on one subject last September, Mr. Randall said he proposed to restore the steps to their original

incline (thereby preserving the Watergate as provided in the Plan of 1901) and have a road going under the steps, instead of running along the top of the steps divided. The steps have a length of ~~2~~ 300 feet, and it is proposed to light the Underpass, leading then to the abutment of the bridge, with the exit at the center of the two posts, and showing an arch, on the south side of the bridge. Mr. Kendall said he had moved the pylons back 18 feet, but that this did not materially affect the Bridge Plaza, which is about 300 feet wide from the edge of the Great Circle of the Lincoln Memorial to the entrance of the bridge.

Mr. Moore said the question had been raised whether or not the steps could be omitted, and the shore line given a simple terrace treatment as along the Seine, or at St. Germain, Paris, but that at the same time it was a fact that in the miles of waterfront of the National Capital there is not a single decent landing as an approach to or from the river. Mr. Kendall said that he wanted the Water-gate retained by all means. He called attention to the steps of the Piazza di Spagna, which are a feature of Rome.

The Commission considered the sketch submitted by Mr. Kendall. Mr. Morris asked Colonel Grant whether he felt the action taken at this meeting would be satisfactory to him, or whether he desired that the matter be taken up in consultation with former members of the Commission of Fine Arts. Col. Grant replied that he thought the plan had been well considered, and the question of an Underpass determined upon by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts; so that at this time he ~~is~~ regarded it primarily a question of design to provide for the Underpass. The action taken by the Commission of Fine Arts in the matter, he said, he would report to the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission, with a statement concerning it, who he thought would undoubtedly endorse the plan and recommendations made.

Thereupon the Commission of Fine Arts unanimously approved Mr. Kendall's revised sketch submitted, providing for an Under-pass, to extend under the Water-gate to the abutment of the bridge. (Exhibit O).

Mr. Kendall said he was much gratified over this action taken and that he would submit a complete drawing of this plan to the Commission.

21. ARLINGTON MEMORIAL BRIDGE, Sculpture for the Bridge: Mr. Kendall said the question of sculpture for the bridge had reached the stage where it required attention, and that of special importance at this time is the sculpture for the six pylons, and the forty statues for the bridge, 20 on each side. Mr. Kendall submitted a list of sculptors, recommending Mr. French, Mr. Adams, and Mr. Fraser, for the sculptors of the pylons; and about 15 names for the bridge statues, for the consideration of the Commission.

The Commission approved the recommendation as to the sculptors for the pylons, and said both pylons and the figure for it (which should be seated) should be all of one kind of stone. It was decided that work on the sculpture for the pylons be taken up at once, to which Col. Grant agreed.

It was decided to give further consideration to the list of sculptors for the bridge statues, the names thus far agreed upon being:

Robert I. Aitken	Charles Grafly	Anna Hyatt (Huntington)
Sterling Calder	John Gregory	Paul Jennewein
Sherry Fry,	Walker Hancock	Tom Jones

imagine (possibly preserving the bridge as provided in the plan of 1901) and have a road going under the steps, instead of running along the top of the steps divided. The steps have a length of 500 feet, and it is proposed to light the underpass, leaving open to the apartment of the bridge, with the exit at the center of the two piers, and leaving an arch, on the south side of the bridge. Mr. Kendall said he had moved the pylons back 15 feet, but that this did not materially affect the bridge plan, which is about 500 feet wide from the edge of the Great Circle of the Lincoln Memorial to the entrance of the bridge.

Mr. Moore said the question had been raised whether or not the steps could be omitted, and the shore line given a slight terrace treatment as along the line, or at St. Germain, Paris, but that at the same time it was a fact that in the miles of waterfront of the National Capital there is not a single decent landing as an approach to or from the river. Mr. Kendall said that he wanted the water-gate retained by all means. He called attention to the steps of the Plaza de Espana, which are a feature of Rome.

The Commission considered the sketch submitted by Mr. Kendall, Mr. Morris asked Colonel Grant whether he felt the action taken at this meeting would be satisfactory to him, or whether he desired that the latter be taken up in consultation with former members of the Commission of Fine Arts, Col. Grant replied that he thought the plan had been well considered, and the question of an underpass determined upon by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts; so that at this time he regarded it primarily a question of design to provide for the underpass. The action taken by the Commission of Fine Arts in the matter, he said, he would report to the Arlington National Bridge Commission, with a statement concerning it, who he thought would undoubtedly approve the plan and recommendations made.

Thereupon the Commission of Fine Arts unanimously approved Mr. Kendall's revised sketch submitted, providing for an underpass, to extend under the water-gate to the apartment of the bridge. (Exhibit D).

Mr. Kendall said he was much gratified over this action taken and that he would submit a complete drawing of this plan to the Commission.

21. Mr. Kendall said: Mr. Kendall said the question of sculpture for the bridge was raised at the meeting where it required attention, and that of special importance at this time is the sculpture for the air pylons, and the large statues for the bridge, 20 on each side. Mr. Kendall submitted a list of sculptors, recommending Mr. French, Mr. Turner, and Mr. French, for the sculpture of the pylons; and about 15 names for the bridge statues, for the consideration of the Commission.

The Commission approved the recommendation as to the sculptors for the pylons, and said both pylons and the figure for it (which should be seated) should be all of one kind of stone. It was decided that work on the sculpture for the pylons be taken up at once, to which Col. Grant agreed.

It was decided to give further consideration to the list of sculptors for the bridge statues, the names thus far agreed upon being:

Robert L. Allen	Charles Grealy	Anna Scott (Washington)
Stirling Cooper	John Gregory	Paul Jernstein
Sherry Fry	Walter Lamson	Tom Jones

Charles Keck
Herman MacNeil
Edward McCartan
Edmond T. Quinn

Edmond R. Amatais
Chester Beach
Berthold Nebel

As for cost of the statuary, Mr. Kendall submitted the following Memorandum:

Arlington Memorial Bridge
Summary of Estimates

December 6, 1927.

	<u>Two Statues</u>	<u>Four Statues</u>
Jones	\$22,000	\$40,000
Jennewein	28,000	48,000
Average	<u>25,000</u>	<u>44,000</u>
Material (x)	2,352	4,704
Total on	27,352	48,704
Average Basis		

(x) Based on estimate received from Georgia Marble Co. of \$5.25 per cubic foot on sidewalk at carvers shop, New York City.

These figures were compared with the estimates made for the statues, as shown in the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission Report (page 46):

Statues along balustrades, 40, \$9,800 \$392,000.

Entrance pylons, Groups, 4, at \$28,000. 112,000.

The question was raised as to grouping the figures for the bridge and it was thought four figures for each pier (two on each side of the bridge) should be studied by a group of sculptors. Georgia Marble was suggested.

Col. Grant said he thought the appropriations did not permit of placing an order at once for the bridge statues, possibly not for a year or so, but that the sculpture for the pylons could be placed under way at once. The Commission recognized this, but in view of the time needed for producing a 10 or 12 foot figure, requiring about two years, the Commission recommended favorable action in this matter of securing the statues for the bridge as soon as possible.

The Commission inspected a quarter scale model of the statue proposed for the bridge, which was placed in the rooms of the Commission, and with Col. Grant and Mr. Kendall inspected a full-sized model of the figure at the bridge. The general mass and height of the figure was approved, though the suggestion was made that it might be well to reduce the figure 6 inches and reduce the fances.

The Commission also inspected a model of a buffalo head for the bridge designed by A. Phimister Proctor, Sculptor. Mr. Taft said the figure is too photographic and needs more architecture; and instead of the "ribbon" shown as ear drops (intended to fill space), Mr. Taft suggested a simple conventionalized garland of flowers. With these suggestions the Commission approved the model. (Exhibit P).

Alfred A. Lambdin
Gustav Jacob
Berthold Weber

Charles Beck
Herman Jacob
Edward Jacobson
Edmond T. Quinn

is for cost of the statue, Mr. Lambdin submitted the following:

Memorandum:

December 6, 1927.

Statue of the Unknown Soldier
Project of the Commission

Four Statues		Two Statues	
440,000	440,000	220,000	220,000
125,000	125,000	110,000	110,000
565,000	565,000	330,000	330,000
10,000	10,000	20,000	20,000
575,000	575,000	350,000	350,000

(2) Based on estimate received from the artist, Mr. Lambdin, of \$3,250 for each foot on sidewalk at corner of New York City.

These figures were compared with the estimates made for the statue, as shown in the "Statue of the Unknown Soldier" Report (page 46):

Statue and pedestal, 40,000,000
Entrance plaza, 115,000,000

The statue was raised as to ground the figure for the bridge and it was thought that the figure (two on each side of the bridge) should be studied by a group of sculptors. The artist's fee was suggested.

Col. Lambdin said he thought the specifications did not permit of placing an ornament on the bridge statue, possibly not for a year or so, but that the sculpture for the figure could be placed under way at once. The Commission recommended this, but in view of the time needed for preparing a 10 or 12 foot figure, requiring about two years, the Commission recommended a bronze statue in this matter of securing the statue for the bridge as soon as possible.

The Commission instructed a sculptor to make a model of the statue proposed for the bridge, which was placed in the room of the Commission, and with Col. Lambdin and Mr. Lambdin inspected a full-sized model of the figure at the bridge. The General was and height of the figure was approved, and the suggestion was made that it might be well to reduce the figure 6 inches and reduce the base.

The Commission also instructed a model of a half to be made for the bridge. The artist, Mr. Lambdin, said the figure in the photograph and needs more work; and instead of the "bridge" group as an idea (intended to fill space), Mr. Lambdin suggested a single conventionalized figure of a soldier. With these suggestions the Commission approved the model. (Exhibit B).

22. "OUTER PARKS" PROJECTS FOR THE NATIONAL CAPITAL: By letter dated November 8, 1927, the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, through Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Executive and Disbursing Officer, submitted plans for the following park and parkway projects, concerning which the advice of the Commission of Fine Arts was desired:--

1. Shepherd Parkway;
2. Fort Stanton -Battery Rickets;
3. Foundry Branch Parkway between Reservoir Road and the River;
4. Piney Branch, north side West of 16th Street;
5. Langdon - Woodridge Park.

It was noted that as to some of these projects the Commission had heretofore approved the purchases of certain specific parcels.

After consideration and inspection of the plot plans, the Commission approved the purchase of all the land shown in the plans for these projects for the National Capital Park System. (Exhibit Q).

23. NEW BOAT HOUSE ALONG TIDAL BASIN: Col. Grant requested the advice of the Commission as to rebuilding the boat house along the Tidal Basin. The Commission interposed no objection to this, and raised the question whether or not it could be built along the east side of the Basin, near where the old bathing house stood, as it would be nearer a car line there. Col. Grant said that this was an interurban line; that the Potomac Park line comes near to the foot of 17th Street, where it is proposed to locate the new boat house, and maintain also a "soft drink" stand now operating there. Col. Grant informed the Commission that Mr. Wm. Partridge, architect for the Navy Department for years, and one of the draftsmen of the Park Commission of 1901 under Mr. McKim, has taken up duties with the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, and would assist in the preparation of the design.

24. TYPE OF PRIVATE OFFICE BUILDINGS ALONG THE NORTH SIDE OF PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE: In behalf of the Public Buildings Commission, Col. Grant submitted a letter, placing before the Commission of Fine Arts, the question as to type of buildings along the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, including private office buildings as may be erected from time to time, in view of their proximity to the new public buildings on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue, and considering the fact also that Pennsylvania Avenue is the great thoroughfare at the heart of the Nation. He said he felt it was important to have advice in this matter because of the United Cigar Store building project, and to give notice to others that are contemplating a building the erection on Pennsylvania Avenue as to what would be expected of them. The letter reads as follows:

December 9, 1927.

"Mr. Charles Moore, Chairman,
Commission of Fine Arts, Interior Bldg.,
Washington, D.C.
My dear Mr. Moore:

"Subject: Shipstead bill;
character of north side of
Penna. Ave."

The case of the United Cigar Stores' new building has raised the ~~xx~~ question ~~xx~~ of just what sort of buildings should be constructed on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue. Some little activity in such construction is already beginning to manifest itself, this cigar stores' project being merely one of several cases that have come to my attention recently. It would, therefore, seem of great help if your Commission could express its views as to the general character of construction that would

be acceptable on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue for the information and guidance of those who are considering such building.

"In connection with the discussion of the Shipstead bill, it was also brought up that the opposition to it might be much less could property owners be informed in advance of what they could do and what they couldn't do, just as they are in regard to zoning by the publication of regulations and zoning maps. Should your Commission make a reasonable and convincing general statement in regard to the treatment of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue at the present time, I believe it would go a long way towards neutralizing the main objections made to this bill, namely, that you may not be reasonable in administering the control which it proposes to put in the hands of your Commission.

"Manifestly at the present time you can hardly draw up a complete set of regulations and limitations for buildings on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, but I feel that a general statement of your views and what you will favor will be both acceptable and helpful at the present time.

Sincerely yours,

U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer."

The Commission recognized the importance of the subject and took the matter under advisement. It was suggested that the ideal type of building for the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue was indicated by the designs for the Civic Center Group which were approved at this meeting; that they are of a classical order, conforming to the new public buildings on the south side of Pennsylvania Avenue.

Mr. Morris offered the following suggestions for consideration: Color tone in harmony with Indiana Limestone, light granite, or marble. Dignified and scholarly type of architecture. Avoidance of meretricious imitation in materials and design. Discontinuance of permits to erect bay window projections beyond building or property limit.

It was noted that the area affected in this matter of private buildings on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue would in particular be that between Seventh and Fifteenth Streets, as the area from Seventh Street east to the Capitol Grounds would be taken up by the Civic Center Group and public building requirements near the Capitol.

The Commission adjourned Friday evening at 5:00 p.m. On Thursday evening the Commission were the guests of President and Mrs. Coolidge at the Diplomatic Reception at the White House. Also, on Thursday evening the Commission were the guests of Mr. Moore at dinner at the Cosmos Club, and of Col. Grant at luncheon on Friday.

be acceptable on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue for the
information and advice of those who are concerned with the
situation. In connection with the situation of the Capital Hill,
it was also pointed out that the opposition to it could be made less
properly owners be informed in advance of what they could do and what
they couldn't do, just as they are in regard to the question
of the Washington and Annapolis area. Should your Commission make a
recommendation and a working general statement in regard to the situation
of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue to the House, I believe
it would be a long way towards realizing the situation made
to this bill, namely, that you may have made in Washington
the central which it proposed to put in the hands of your Commission.
"I believe at the present time you are in a very good position
to make a statement on this question to the House, and I think it
very wise to do so. I think it is a good idea to have a statement
and what you will have will be a very complete and useful at the
present time."

Sincerely yours,

W. A. Rorer

Executive and Planning Director

The Commission has received the information of the House and will the latter
under agreement. It was suggested that the ideal type of building for the north
side of Pennsylvania Avenue was indicated by the House for the House Center
group which were approved at the meeting; that they are of a classical order,
conforming to the new building style in the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue.
The House offered the following suggestions for consideration: (1) to
be harmony with the House Center, light granite, or marble, or light
and modern type of architecture, avoidance of neoclassical imitation
in materials and design. (2) to provide for a good view of the
projections beyond building on property line.

It was noted that the area situated in this matter of private buildings on
the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue would in addition be used between
Seventh and Fifteenth Streets, as the area from Seventh Street east to the Capitol
grounds would be taken up by the State Center Group and public building
requirements near the Capitol.

The Commission adjourned Friday evening at 8:00 p.m. On Thursday

evening the Commission were the guests of President and Mrs. Coolidge at the

Official Reception at the White House. Also, on Thursday evening the

Commission were the guests of Mr. Rorer at dinner at the House Club, and

at 5:30, spent at luncheon on Friday.

COPY

December 16, 1927.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts approve the revised design submitted by the United Cigar Stores Company for their building at 14th and E Streets, N.W., in this city. The Commission realize that the construction of the show windows is subject to permit issued in accordance with existing Building Regulations of the District of Columbia. In the opinion of this Commission, the design would be much improved by omitting the projecting show windows. It is understood that the building is to be constructed of limestone throughout.

The Commission desire to express their appreciation of the helpful spirit in which their suggestions have been met by you and your Washington architect, Mr. Julius Wenig; and they venture to express the hope that the executed work will prove satisfactory to your company as well as to the Washington public.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. H. G. Mitchell,
The United Cigar Stores Company,
44 West 18th Street,
New York, N.Y.

Exhibit A

December 10, 1937.

Dear Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts approve the revised design submitted by the United States Stores Company for their building at 14th and B Streets, N.W., in this city. The Commission believes that the cancellation of the show windows is subject to permit issued in accordance with existing Building Regulations of the District of Columbia. In the opinion of this Commission, the design would be much improved by omitting the projecting show windows. It is understood that the building is to be constructed of limestone throughout.

The Commission desires to express their appreciation of the helpful spirit in which their suggestions have been met by you and your Washington architect, Mr. Julius Kent; and they venture to express the hope that the completed work will prove satisfactory to your company as well as to the Washington Public.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. E. A. Mitchell,
The United States Stores Company,
44 West 14th Street,
New York, N.Y.

Exhibit A

COPY

December 14, 1927.

Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, considered with interest the sketch plans submitted in your behalf by Major L. E. Atkins, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner, and Mr. A. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, for the location and development of a Municipal Center on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, in the squares adjacent to John Marshall Place, between Third and Sixth Streets. The preliminary layout was approved.

If Congress should declare its intention to take over for the use of the District of Columbia the entire area indicated on the plan, then the Commissioners might be authorized to acquire immediately the sites for the Police Court and other buildings for which there is urgent present need, and could proceed with the development of a group plan, of which the structures indicated would form a constituent part.

Such a declaration also would have the effect of providing for the ultimate reclamation of what is now the least desirable portion of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, and insure the adequate development of that historic thoroughfare in an orderly manner, in keeping with the Government development on the south side.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B

December 11, 1937.

Sir:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1937, considered with interest the sketch plans submitted in your letter of Major J. M. Harris, Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner, and Mr. L. L. Harris, Municipal Resident, for the location and development of a Municipal Center on the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, in the squares adjacent to John Marshall Place, between Third and Fifth Streets. The preliminary report was approved.

It is the Commission's desire to have the entire area indicated on the plan, then the Commissioners might be authorized to acquire immediately the sites for the Police Court and other buildings for which there is urgent present need, and could proceed with the development of a group plan, of which the structures indicated would form a constituent part. Such a declaration also would have the effect of providing for the ultimate reclamation of land to now the least desirable portion of the north side of Pennsylvania Avenue, and insure the adequate development of that historic thoroughfare in an orderly manner, in keeping with the Government development on the south side.

Very respectfully,
For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Enclosure

COPY

December 13, 1927.

Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, considered the design submitted in your behalf by Mr. A. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, for a Fire Engine House at Sixteenth and Webster Streets.

As to the design, the following suggestions have been made to the architect:

1. Reduce the mass of the piers;
2. Raise the height of the drum under the column of the tower;
3. Reduce the cornice in mass.

The Commission suggest that the location of the engine house be changed from Sixteenth Street to such a near-by site as may serve the interests of the Fire Department. Sixteenth Street is sought for sites of churches and institutions. It is subject at all times to an intense traffic for light vehicles. Congress is creating Meridian Hill Park to accommodate within a small area a park for the use of the greatest possible number of people. In the locality of Webster Street the houses are mainly detached and single. A fire engine house located there would depreciate property unnecessarily; it would make a noisy runway for engines, to the danger of heavy volume of traffic, and the disturbance of the residents and congregations. In short it would do much to destroy the established character of Sixteenth Street, would be a detriment to good order, and an offence to the residents.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

The Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Exhibit C

December 12, 1934

Sir:

The Commission of this date, at their meeting on December 8, 1934, considered the design submitted in your behalf by Mr. J. L. Harris, Municipal Architect, for a Fire Engine House at Sixteenth and Webster Streets. As to the design, the following suggestions have been made to the

Architect:

1. Reduce the mass of the tower;
2. Raise the height of the drum under the column of the tower;
3. Reduce the cornice in mass.

The Commission suggest that the location of the engine house be changed from Sixteenth Street to near a north-south side as they serve the interests of the Fire Department. Sixteenth Street is subject for heavy traffic for light installations. It is subject at all times to an intense traffic for light vehicles. Therefore it is suggested that the house be located within a small area a yard or two from the west of the present location of the house. The facility of Webster Street at the house is mainly detached and single. A fire engine house located there would depreciate property unnecessarily; it would make a noisy runway for engines, to the danger of heavy volume of traffic, and the disturbance of the residents and congestions. In short it would do much to destroy the established character of Sixteenth Street, would be a detriment to good order, and an offense to the residents.

For the Commission of this date:

Very respectfully, yours,

The Board of Commissioners
of the District of Columbia
Washington, D.C.

Charles Moore,
City Engineer

COPY

December 22, 1927.

Dear Major Atkins:

Your communication of December 8th, inquiring as to the proper kind of face brick, for buildings constructed by the District of Columbia, received the consideration of the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting that day.

As to the question raised whether the so-called hydraulic-pressed brick can properly be classified as a colonial brick, there is in the opinion of the Commission no distinct "colonial brick, but that there is a great difference between the so-called colonial brick and the hydraulic-pressed brick, due to the method of manufacture, which gives pressed brick an artificial appearance.

The hydraulic-pressed brick even with sanded surface would not in the opinion of the Commission be a satisfactory brick from an architectural standpoint for use in a building of colonial design.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major L. E. Atkins, Corps of Engineers, U.S.A.,
Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the
District of Columbia,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit D

December 12, 1921

Dear Sir:

Your communication of December 6th, regarding the
 proposed plan of the bridge, for building constructed by the
 District of Columbia, received and consideration of the Commission
 of the site of the bridge is being made.
 As to the question raised whether the so-called hydraulic-
 pressed brick can properly be classified as a colonial brick,
 there is in the opinion of the Commission no doubt that colonial
 brick, and that there is a great difference between the so-called
 colonial brick and the hydraulic-pressed brick. Due to the nature
 of manufacture, which gives pressed brick an artificial appearance,
 the hydraulic-pressed brick even with rounded surface would
 not in the opinion of the Commission be a satisfactory brick from
 an architectural standpoint for use in a building of colonial design.
 For the Commission of the site:

Very respectfully,
 Yours,
 Charles Moore,
 Chairman.

Major J. B. Whiting, Corps of Engineers, U.S.A.,
 Assistant to the Engineer Commissioner of the
 District of Columbia,
 Washington, D.C.

Encl. 2

COPY

December 12, 1927.

Dear Sir:

The plans for your proposed office building on the northwest corner of Fourteenth and K Streets, N.W., submitted with your letter of December 7, 1927, by Mr. Robert F. Beresford, architect, received consideration by the Commission of Fine Arts at their meeting on December 8th, and were approved with the suggestion that the "tower" of the building, especially designed for elevator machinery and smokestack in the center of the building, be increased both horizontally and in height. The material proposed for the building is satisfactory to the Commission. Details of the plans, including those for the interior, were considered with the architect and will be incorporated by him in the development of the project.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Bates Warren,

15th and H Streets, N.W.,

Washington, D.C.

Exhibit E

December 12, 1927

Dear Sir:

The plans for your proposed office building at the northeast corner of Front Street and E Street, N.W., submitted with your letter of December 7, 1927, by Mr. Robert V. Burdette, Architect, received consideration by the Commission at their first meeting on December 11th, and were approved with the suggestion that the tower of the building, especially designed for elevator machinery and located in the center of the building, be increased both horizontally and in height. The material proposed for the building is satisfactory to the Commission. Details of the plans, including those for the interior, were considered with the architect and will be incorporated by him in the development of the project.

For the Commission of the District:

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mr. Walter Watson,

Room and E Street, N.W.,

Washington, D.C.

Robert H.

COPY

December 10, 1927.

Dear Governor Campbell:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, approved the plans of the architect, Mr. Wm. Templeton Johnson, which you submitted of the permanent (triangular) building of the United States Government for the Seville International Exposition. The Commission also approved the plans for the two temporary buildings proposed for the Exposition. .

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Thomas E. Campbell,
Commissioner General,
Seville International Exposition Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit F

Document 17, 1930

Very Respectfully,

The Commission of the Arts, at their meeting on December 5, 1930, approved the plans of the architect, Mr. W. H. Johnson, which was submitted to the Commission (Exhibit A) and the United States Government for the Public International Exposition. The Commission also approved the plans for the two temporary buildings proposed for the Exposition.

For the Commission of the Arts:

Very Respectfully,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Hon. Charles D. Brown,
Commissioner General,
Public International Exposition Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit B

COPY

December 10, 1927.

Dear Major Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, considered the design, prepared by Mr. Robert R. Reeves, Architect, which you submitted with your letter of that date for a Hospice and Memorial to be erected by the 37th Division Battle Monuments Commission, at Montfaucon, France. The Commission were well pleased with the design and approved it.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The American Battle Monuments Commission,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit G

December 10, 1937.

Dear Mr. Price:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on November 3, 1937, considered the design, prepared by Mr. Robert L. Taylor, architect, which was submitted with your letter of that date for a bronze and intended to be erected by the War Relocation Authority. The Commission were well pleased with the design and approved it.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The American Red Cross Commission,

Washington, D.C.

Enclosure

December 21, 1927.

Dear Colonel Markham:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your behalf by Captain John E. Wood for the landscape development of Fort Humphreys, Virginia. These plans carry out recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 14th, after an inspection of the grounds, and have particular reference to---

1. Non-Commissioned Officers Quarters Area: The Commission approve unanimously Scheme B. The idea of a common facing the chapel gives it an excellent setting. There are also provided in the plan restricted areas for gardens and multiple garages. These can be made features of the grounds, and group structures of a utilitarian nature that usually are eye-sores in a composition.

2. Regimental Parade: The Commission approve Scheme A. The trees on the Regimental Parade should not be closer to the building than 35 feet. Grass should be planted in the Regimental Parade.

3. Circulation Center: The design submitted offers an orderly solution of the problem; but the Commission would prefer the scheme sent to you which was offered by Mr. Vitale, landscape architect member of the Commission, for the Circulation Center. He suggests a rectangular treatment instead of the elliptical plan as proposed.

4. Artificial Lake: The lake proposed for the grounds should be provided, as being one of the important features in the plan of development.

5. Sign posts and direction signs: The Commission approve the idea of having sign posts and direction signs, according to the design submitted. They will add interest to the grounds. It is important that they be kept simple and carefully executed. The sign post should be in good proportion to the sign, which should not be too high from the ground, -9 feet, instead of 10 as proposed, being deemed sufficient.

6. The plan for the lay-out of the roads in and adjacent to Fort Humphreys is approved.

The Commission suggest that the Forest Service of the Agricultural Department be called upon to assist you in the development of the Fort Humphreys reservation in the matter of trees and shrubbery. Also the Bureau of Public Roads of that Department could doubtless be of assistance in the matter of roadways.

The Commission realize that this entire plan for the development of Fort Humphreys will require a number of years for completion. The Commission have had pleasure in going over the details in your behalf with Captain Wood, and regret that he is about to leave Fort Humphreys and go to a new post of duty. The Commission hope that someone at Fort Humphreys will be made responsible for the development of the plan, under your supervision.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Col. E. M. Markham, Corps of Engineers,
Commandant, Headquarters of the Engineer School, U.S.A.
Fort Humphreys, Virginia.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Exhibit H

December 21, 1937.

Dear Sir:

Dear General:

The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

1. The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

2. The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

3. The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

4. The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

5. The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

6. The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

The Commission of the Port of Hampton Roads, Virginia, gave further consideration to plans submitted in your letter of October 1, 1937, and in the light of the recommendations of the Commission made at the meeting on October 15th, after an inspection of the grounds, and in view of the reference to--

Very respectfully,
General

Very respectfully,
General

COPY

December 8, 1927.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, gave consideration to the design which you submitted with your letter of November 25th for the landscape treatment of the Statue of Serenity in Meridian Hill Park.

The design was brought to the particular attention of Mr. Vitale, and upon his recommendation approved, subject to slight changes shown in the accompanying print. The planting suggested in the design should grow quickly and give a good landscape setting to the statue. It will be noted that the print suggests a better grouping of the planting on the sides and back of the statue, and the omission of the berberis in front of it.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d, Director,
Public Buildings and Public Parks
of the National Capital,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit I

1001 0 11/10/00

07-19-1968

Not the Commission of the

100-1000000000

9200 1012-0

[illegible]

1. The first of these is the fact that the
 2.
 3.
 4.
 5.
 6.
 7.
 8.
 9.
 10.
 11.
 12.
 13.
 14.
 15.
 16.
 17.
 18.
 19.
 20.
 21.
 22.
 23.
 24.
 25.
 26.
 27.
 28.
 29.
 30.
 31.
 32.
 33.
 34.
 35.
 36.
 37.
 38.
 39.
 40.
 41.
 42.
 43.
 44.
 45.
 46.
 47.
 48.
 49.
 50.
 51.
 52.
 53.
 54.
 55.
 56.
 57.
 58.
 59.
 60.
 61.
 62.
 63.
 64.
 65.
 66.
 67.
 68.
 69.
 70.
 71.
 72.
 73.
 74.
 75.
 76.
 77.
 78.
 79.
 80.
 81.
 82.
 83.
 84.
 85.
 86.
 87.
 88.
 89.
 90.
 91.
 92.
 93.
 94.
 95.
 96.
 97.
 98.
 99.
 100.
 101.
 102.
 103.
 104.
 105.
 106.
 107.
 108.
 109.
 110.
 111.
 112.
 113.
 114.
 115.
 116.
 117.
 118.
 119.
 120.
 121.
 122.
 123.
 124.
 125.
 126.
 127.
 128.
 129.
 130.
 131.
 132.
 133.
 134.
 135.
 136.
 137.
 138.
 139.
 140.
 141.
 142.
 143.
 144.
 145.
 146.
 147.
 148.
 149.
 150.
 151.
 152.
 153.
 154.
 155.
 156.
 157.
 158.
 159.
 160.
 161.
 162.
 163.
 164.
 165.
 166.
 167.
 168.
 169.
 170.
 171.
 172.
 173.
 174.
 175.
 176.
 177.
 178.
 179.
 180.
 181.
 182.
 183.
 184.
 185.
 186.
 187.
 188.
 189.
 190.
 191.
 192.
 193.
 194.
 195.
 196.
 197.
 198.
 199.
 200.
 201.
 202.
 203.
 204.
 205.
 206.
 207.
 208.
 209.
 210.
 211.
 212.
 213.
 214.
 215.
 216.
 217.
 218.
 219.
 220.
 221.
 222.
 223.
 224.
 225.
 226.
 227.
 228.
 229.
 230.
 231.
 232.
 233.
 234.
 235.
 236.
 237.
 238.
 239.
 240.
 241.
 242.
 243.
 244.
 245.
 246.
 247.
 248.
 249.
 250.
 251.
 252.
 253.
 254.
 255.
 256.
 257.
 258.
 259.
 260.
 261.
 262.
 263.
 264.
 265.
 266.
 267.
 268.
 269.
 270.
 271.
 272.
 273.
 274.
 275.
 276.
 277.
 278.
 279.
 280.
 281.
 282.
 283.
 284.
 285.
 286.
 287.
 288.
 289.
 290.
 291.
 292.
 293.
 294.
 295.
 296.
 297.
 298.
 299.
 300.
 301.
 302.
 303.
 304.
 305.
 306.
 307.
 308.
 309.
 310.
 311.
 312.
 313.
 314.
 315.
 316.
 317.
 318.
 319.
 320.
 321.
 322.
 323.
 324.
 325.
 326.
 327.
 328.
 329.
 330.
 331.
 332.
 333.
 334.
 335.
 336.
 337.
 338.
 339.
 340.
 341.
 342.
 343.
 344.
 345.
 346.
 347.
 348.
 349.
 350.
 351.
 352.
 353.
 354.
 355.
 356.
 357.
 358.
 359.
 360.
 361.
 362.
 363.
 364.
 365.
 366.
 367.
 368.
 369.
 370.
 371.
 372.
 373.
 374.
 375.
 376.
 377.
 378.
 379.
 380.
 381.
 382.
 383.
 384.
 385.
 386.
 387.
 388.
 389.
 390.
 391.
 392.
 393.
 394.
 395.
 396.
 397.
 398.
 399.
 400.
 401.
 402.
 403.
 404.
 405.
 406.
 407.
 408.
 409.
 410.
 411.
 412.
 413.
 414.
 415.
 416.
 417.
 418.
 419.
 420.
 421.
 422.
 423.
 424.
 425.
 426.
 427.
 428.
 429.
 430.
 431.
 432.
 433.
 434.
 435.
 436.
 437.
 438.
 439.
 440.
 441.
 442.
 443.
 444.
 445.
 446.
 447.
 448.
 449.
 450.
 451.
 452.
 453.
 454.
 455.
 456.
 457.
 458.
 459.
 460.
 461.
 462.
 463.
 464.
 465.
 466.
 467.
 468.
 469.
 470.
 471.
 472.
 473.
 474.
 475.
 476.
 477.
 478.
 479.
 480.
 481.
 482.
 483.
 484.
 485.
 486.
 487.
 488.
 489.
 490.
 491.
 492.
 493.
 494.
 495.
 496.
 497.
 498.
 499.
 500.
 501.
 502.
 503.
 504.
 505.
 506.
 507.
 508.
 509.
 510.
 511.
 512.
 513.
 514.
 515.
 516.
 517.
 518.
 519.
 520.
 521.
 522.
 523.
 524.
 525.
 526.
 527.
 528.
 529.
 530.
 531.
 532.
 533.
 534.
 535.
 536.
 537.
 538.
 539.
 540.
 541.
 542.
 543.
 544.
 545.
 546.
 547.
 548.
 549.
 550.
 551.
 552.
 553.
 554.
 555.
 556.
 557.
 558.
 559.
 560.
 561.
 562.
 563.
 564.
 565.
 566.
 567.
 568.
 569.
 570.
 571.
 572.
 573.
 574.
 575.
 576.
 577.
 578.
 579.
 580.
 581.
 582.
 583.
 584.
 585.
 586.
 587.
 588.
 589.
 590.
 591.
 592.
 593.
 594.
 595.
 596.
 597.
 598.
 599.

— ۱ —

COPY

December 12, 1927.

Dear Mr. Hopkins:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, approved the design you submitted for the proposed bridge of the Pennsylvania Railroad at the head of Water Street, this city, subject to the changes indicated on the design. These pertained particularly to the panels and the piers.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. J. G. Hopkins,
Division Engineer,
Pennsylvania Railroad,
Baltimore, Md.

Exhibit J

COPY

December 21, 1927.

Dear Mr. Hopkins:

The Commission of Fine Arts approve the new design submitted for the panel of the girder for your proposed Water Street Bridge in this city, carrying out the suggestions of the Commission at their meeting on December 8, 1927.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Mr. J. G. Hopkins,
Division Engineer,
Pennsylvania Railroad,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit J-1

100

December 12, 1937

Dear Mr. [Name]:

The Commission of the [Name] at its meeting on December 8, 1937, approved the design for the proposed bridge at the Pennsylvania Railroad at the head of Water Street, this city, subject to the changes indicated on the design. These changes are particularly to the piers and the floor.

For the Commission of the [Name]:

Very respectfully,
[Name]
Chairman

Mr. E. J. [Name],
Division Engineer,
Pennsylvania Railroad,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Exhibit 3

100

December 21, 1937

Dear Mr. [Name]:

The Commission of the [Name] has approved the new design submitted for the piers of the bridge over proposed Water Street Bridge in this city, submitted at the session of the Commission at their meeting on December 8, 1937.

For the Commission of the [Name]:

Very respectfully,
[Name]
Chairman

Mr. E. J. [Name],
Division Engineer,
Pennsylvania Railroad,
Philadelphia, Pa.

Exhibit 3-1

COPY

October 20, 1927.

Dear Colonel Cosby:

It is good to see your signature at the bottom of a letter. I am personally very much interested in the particular development of the Government park at Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan, the chief ornamental figure of which is the obelisk of granite designed by Charles McKim and erected to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of opening the locks around St. Mary's Falls. Your letter brings back the struggles of 1905, when a determined effort was made to put a boulder with a bronze plate in the space between the Poe Lock and the Weitzel Lock. It seemed to me that a boulder was not a significant monument for a work of engineering and that no place in immediate connection with the locks would long retain supremacy, owing to the creation of new locks in the river and the shifting of the point of interest. Therefore the monument was placed on the axis of one of the main streets of Sault Ste. Marie on the hill where it would have the river and the passing shipping for a background. A small amount of money left over was entrusted to the engineers for landscape work and the care of the monument. I suppose it has been used. It will interest you to know that the obelisk itself, 42 feet high, is the tallest single stone in any monument in the United States. The proportions are those of the obelisk in Central Park, New York. On the tablets I tried to write the history of the "Soo" for 300 years since the first white man appeared on the scene.

I am sure the Commission of Fine Arts will cooperate in every way to secure a proper plan for the treatment of the park spaces belonging to the United States. As a preliminary I suggest that a tracing be made showing the locks, the park adjacent thereto, the area occupied by the town, and then the long park stretching down to the power house. If the roads and trees could be indicated on this tracing we would have a real beginning.

The Burnham boys are frequently at Mackinac Island, where Hubert Burnham has a summer home. Dan Burnham does a good deal of planning work and perhaps this would interest him. Mr. Manning, the landscape architect, was employed by the State of Michigan to do some work in connection with the State Park at Mackinac Island and also the restoration of the old stockade at Mackinaw City. I am quite surprised at what you say about there being plenty of trees. There were very few trees in the lower park when I last was there a few years ago.

Cordially, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Col. Spencer Cosby, Corps of Engineers,
Division Engineer, Lakes Division,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Exhibit K

October 20, 1937

Dear Colonel Gandy:

It is good to see your statement at the bottom of a letter. I am generally very much interested in the particular development of the Government part of the building, which is a very important figure of which is the obelisk of granite designed by Daniel Libeskind and erected to commemorate the fiftieth anniversary of opening the lock around St. Mary's Hall. Your letter brings back the memory of 1903, when a determined effort was made to put a building with a bronze plate in the space between the two locks and the watered lock. It seemed to me that a building was not a sufficient answer for a work of engineering and that no place in immediate connection with the locks would long retain supremacy, owing to the creation of new locks in the river and the addition of the point of interest. Therefore the monument was placed on the site of one of the main streets of the city. It is in two hills which it would have the river and the passing bridge for a background. A small amount of money left over was entrusted to the engineer for landscape work and the care of the monument. I suppose it has been used. It will interest you to know that the obelisk itself, at least high, is the tallest obelisk stone in any monument in the United States. The proportions are those of the obelisk in Central Park, New York. On the tablet I tried to write the history of the "200" for 200 years since the first white man appeared on the scene.

I am sure the Commission of the Arts will cooperate in every way to secure a proper plan for the treatment of the park spaces belonging to the United States. As a preliminary, I suggest that a tracing be made showing the locks, the park adjacent thereto, the area occupied by the town, and then the long wall extending down to the power house. If the roads and trees could be indicated on this tracing we would have a real beginning.

The Durham boys are frequently at Lockwood Island, where Herbert Durham has a summer home. Tom Durham does a good deal of planning work and perhaps this would interest you. Mr. Manning, the landscape architect, was employed by the State of Illinois to do some work in connection with the State Park at Lockwood Island and also the restoration of the old racecourse at Lockwood Island. I am quite surprised at what you say about there being plenty of trees. There were very few trees in the lower park when I last was there a few years ago.

Cordially, yours,
Lester B. Brown,
Landscape Architect.

Col. Spencer Gandy, Office of Engineers,
Division Engineer, Lakes Division,
Cleveland, Ohio.

Enclosed M

44 Stat. Page 699, Public No. 343, 69th Congress.

An Act granting the consent of Congress to the Wakefield National Memorial Association to build, upon Government-owned land at Wakefield, Westmoreland County, Virginia, a replica of the house in which George Washington was born, and for other purposes.

BE IT ENACTED BY THE SENATE AND HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA IN CONGRESS ASSEMBLED, That permission is hereby given to the Wakefield National Memorial Association, of Washington, District of Columbia, a corporation created by and existing under the laws of the State of Virginia, its successors and assigns, to build, operate, and maintain upon the plot of ground owned by the United States at Wakefield, Westmoreland County, Virginia, a replica, as nearly as may be practicable, of the house in which George Washington was born, to be used and occupied in such manner and for such purposes in preserving the memory of George Washington as may be appropriate: PROVIDED, That the size and location of the area to be set aside for improvement by said association shall be determined by the Secretary of War: AND PROVIDED, That the plans for the building herein authorized and for the landscape treatment and development of the grounds before being carried into effect shall receive the approval of the Fine Arts Commission and the Secretary of War; AND PROVIDED, That no work shall be commenced until the Secretary of War has been assured that funds are available for the completion of the work herein authorized: AND PROVIDED FURTHER, That the operation, maintenance, care, charging of fees, and any other function carried on by the said association within the area set aside for its use, shall be subject to the supervision of the Secretary of War, and in accordance with such regulations as the said Secretary may promulgate.

APPROVED: June 7, 1926.

[illegible]

It is a fact that the Government of the United States has been very successful in its efforts to bring about a more efficient and economical administration of its affairs. This has been accomplished through the use of modern methods of organization and management. The Government has been able to reduce its expenditures and increase its efficiency. This has been done by the use of the principles of organization and management. The Government has been able to bring about a more efficient and economical administration of its affairs. This has been accomplished through the use of modern methods of organization and management. The Government has been able to reduce its expenditures and increase its efficiency. This has been done by the use of the principles of organization and management.

RECEIVED

COPY

December 15, 1927.

Dear Mrs. Rust:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 9, 1927, considered with you the design submitted by the Wakefield National Memorial Association of the birthplace of George Washington at Wakefield, prepared by Mr. Edward W. Donn, Jr., architect.

The Commission approve the design of the house. While no representations of the Washington house have come down to us, the design submitted conforms to the type of house actually built by colonists at the time when George Washington's father built his home on lands that had been in the possession of his ancestors.

There is sufficient documentary testimony as to the character of the house to guide the architect as to size and general disposition of the grounds, and the location of the buildings appertaining to the mansion. The excavation of the foundations is a further (although not a conclusive) guide in these particulars.

The Commission approve the location of the house on the original site, it being understood that the building is to be used as a museum, and open to the public, furnished with original furniture belonging to it, or with contemporary furniture; the object being to reproduce the conditions of living during the time of George Washington's boyhood. The Commission do not think it desirable to attempt to preserve the outlines of the structure as indicated by the excavations, since the results of the digging are too meager and too fragmentary to be convincing; and especially since in the opinion of the architect the outlines as disclosed are inconsistent with those of any known building.

The Commission approve the proposed removal of the present monument possibly to another site. The monument is of a design once used in cemeteries, but now generally regarded as inappropriate even for such uses. It is manifestly inappropriate to mark a birthplace.

The Commission approve the project of the Wakefield National Memorial Association to build on that portion of the Augustine Washington lands known as Duck Hall a building for the refreshment of the public and the accommodation of visitors, the design of such building to be submitted later, together with other details of the restoration plans.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Mrs. H. L. Rust, President,
Wakefield National Memorial Association,
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit L-2

December 10, 1937

Dear Sirs, Please:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 9, 1937, considered with you the design submitted by the Warfield Memorial Association of the site of the George Washington at Warfield, prepared by Mr. Edward D. Jones, Jr., architect.

The Commission approved the design of the house. While no representations of the Washington House have come down to us, the design admitted conforms to the type of house actually built by colonists at the time George Washington's father built his house on lands that had been in the possession of his ancestors.

There is sufficient documentary testimony as to the character of the house to guide the architect as to size and general disposition of the grounds, and the location of the building according to the location. The excavation of the foundations is a further (although not a conclusive) guide in these particulars.

The Commission approved the location of the house on the original site, it being understood that the building is to be used as a museum, and open to the public, furnished with original furniture belonging to it, or with contemporary furniture; the object being to reproduce the conditions of living during the time of George Washington's boyhood. The Commission do not think it desirable to attempt to preserve the outlines of the structure as indicated by the excavations, since the results of the digging are too meager and too fragmentary to be convincing; and especially since in the opinion of the architect and others as discussed are inconsistent with those of any known building.

The Commission approve the proposed removal of the present monument possibly to another site. The monument is of a design once used in cemeteries, but now generally regarded as inappropriate even for such uses. It is respectfully suggested to make a difference.

The Commission approve the project of the Warfield Memorial Association to build on that portion of the Washington Memorial lands known as Dumbarton a building for the refreshment of the public and the accommodation of visitors. The design of such building to be submitted later, together with other details of the restoration plans.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully,
 yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman

Mr. H. H. West, President,
 Warfield Memorial Association,
 Washington, D.C.

COPY

December 21, 1927.

My dear Mr. Lodge:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8th, welcomed the opportunity to consider the plans made by Mr. Charles A. Platt for the development of a garden in connection with the Freer Gallery of Art, inasmuch as the building has seemed to them incomplete without some such landscape setting as is now proposed.

The Freer building was located in accordance with the Mall Plan of 1901. The Commission suggest that, in connection with the work on the garden, the grades in front of the building be revised to conform to the grades as planned south of the main Mall road, that worthy existing trees be saved and that in vacant spaces elms be planted according to the Mall Plan. All this work is necessary to give the Gallery its appropriate landscape setting.

South of the service Mall road the treatment may be adapted to the purposes and uses of the building itself, which in this case means a garden. This garden should be developed for the display of such works of art as are appropriate to a garden. The only question in the minds of the Commission is as to whether additional land on the east might not be included.

The Commission approve the plan as presented.

Sincerely yours,

John E. Lodge, Esq., Curator,
Freer Gallery of Art,
Washington, D.C.

Charles Moore,
Chairman.

(Exhibit M)

December 11, 1901.

My dear Mr. Lodge:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 6th,

welcomed the opportunity to consider the plans made by Mr. Charles L.

Plett for the development of a garden in connection with the new

Gallery of Art, inasmuch as the building has seemed to them incomplete

without some such landscape setting as is now proposed.

The new building was located in accordance with the plan

of 1901. The Commission suggest that, in connection with the work on

the garden, the grades in front of the building be revised to conform to

the grades as planned south of the main Mall road, that worthy existing

trees be saved and that in vacant spaces other be planted according to the

plan there. All this work is necessary to give the Gallery its appropriate

landscape setting.

South of the new building the treatment may be adapted to the

purpose and uses of the building itself, which in this case means a garden.

This garden should be developed for the display of new works of art as

are appropriate to a garden. The only question in the mind of the

Commission is as to whether additional land on the east might not be

included.

The Commission approve the plan as presented.

Sincerely yours,

Charles Moore,
Secretary.

John C. Lodge, M.D., Director,
New Gallery of Art,
Washington, D.C.

(Exhibit A)

COPY

December 19, 1927.

Dear Mr. Fraser:

Hon. Victor K. Houston, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, has asked the Commission of Fine Arts to advise as to a design for their proposed Hawaii Sesquicentennial half-dollar, with the accompanying sketches as suggested designs for obverse and reverse.

The matter received attention by the Commission at the meeting December 9th, and Mr. Taft suggested that you select a medallist suitable for the work. The legislation is still pending in Congress, though without doubt it will be enacted; and no fund has been made available for making the design. In the circumstances what would you suggest and whom?

Cordially yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

James E. Fraser, Esq.,
328 East 42d Street,
New York, N.Y.

Exhibit N

December 12, 1937.

Dear Mr. E. E. Brown:

Hon. Victor K. Hixon, Delegate to Congress from Hawaii, has asked the Commission of Fine Arts to advise as to a design for the proposed Hawaii Bicentennial half-dollar, with the accompanying sketches as suggested designs for obverse and reverse. The matter received attention by the Commission at its meeting December 9th, and Mr. E. E. Brown suggested that you select a medalist suitable for the work. The legislation is still pending in Congress, though without doubt it will be enacted; and no fund has been made available for making the design. In the circumstances what would you suggest and when?

Cordially yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

James E. Brown, Esq.,

328 East 42d Street,

New York, N. Y.

Exhibit B

COPY

December 22, 1927.

Sirs:

The Commission of Fine Arts, after months of consideration and study of many plans and models, have reached the following conclusions in regard to the approaches to the Arlington Memorial Bridge:

The great central composition which gives unity, order and great dignity to the city of Washington as the National Capital, begins with the United States Capitol grounds and extends westward for nearly two-and-a-half miles to the Potomac River. Vitally related with this Mall System are the President's Park and the grounds of the White House. Within this area are two memorials noted among world monuments of the ages--the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

The Mall System proper should have a proper ending at the Potomac River. Such an ending was provided for in the Plan of 1901, which has been familiar to the people of the United States for a quarter of a century, during which period no better solution has been suggested by architects, landscape architects, or laymen. Indeed the whole layout of the Lincoln Memorial has been based upon it. The plan was presented to Congress in the report of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission and the legislation for the bridge and its approaches was predicated upon it.

Since the Plan of 1901 was prepared there has come about an enormous increase in automobile traffic, and it is desirable that the lines of traffic flowing north and south through Potomac Park shall be separated from the lines flowing east and west across the Memorial Bridge. It is this separation of traffic lines that has called for study and solution.

The plan as now recommended by the Commission is to provide for an underpass through the abutment of the bridge approximately at the water level, and carried through under the steps leading from the bridge plaza to the water. Such an underpass will disturb to the least degree the original design, and at the same time will provide for a continuous flow of automobile traffic along the water's edge.

The Commission recognize that any such change must result in certain compromises; but in the present instance there has been no compromise in essentials. Subordinate details, the Commission feel, have been handled by the designers of the bridge in the most satisfactory manner possible.

The revised plans have the unanimous approval of the Commission of Fine Arts.

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,

Washington, D.C.

Exhibit O

December 22, 1937

Sirs:

The Commission on the Arts, after months of consideration and study of many plans and models, have reached the following conclusions in regard to the approaches to the Arlington Memorial Bridge:

The Great central composition which gives unity, order and great dignity to the city of Washington as the National Capital, begins with the United States Capitol grounds and extends westward for nearly two-and-a-half miles to the Potomac River. Vastly related with this Mall system are the President's lawn and the grounds of the White House. Within this area are two memorials noted among world monuments of the ages--the Washington Monument and the Lincoln Memorial.

The Mall system proper should have a proper ending at the Potomac River. From an ending was provided for in the Plan of 1901, which has been familiar to the people of the United States for a quarter of a century. During which period no better solution has been suggested by architects, landscape architects, or engineers. Indeed the whole layout of the Lincoln Memorial has been based upon it. The plan was presented to Congress in the report of the Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission and the legislation for the bridge and its approaches was predicated upon it.

Since the Plan of 1901 was prepared there has been some doubt as to whether an increase in automobile traffic, and it is desirable that the lines of traffic flowing north and south through Potomac Park shall be separated from the lines flowing east and west across the Memorial Bridge. It is this separation of traffic lines that has called for study and solution.

The plan as now recommended by the Commission is to provide for an underpass through the abutment of the bridge approximately at the water level, and carried through under the steps leading from the bridge plaza to the water. Such an underpass will disturb to the least degree the original design, and at the same time will provide for a continuous flow of automobile traffic along the water's edge.

The Commission recognizes that any such change must result in certain compromises; but in the present instance there has been no compromise in essentials. Subordinate details, the Commission feels, have been provided by the designers of the bridge in the most satisfactory manner possible.

The revised plan has the unanimous approval of the Commission of the Arts.

Very respectfully, Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

The Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission.

Washington, D.C.

Encl. 1

COPY

December 14, 1927.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 9, 1927, considered carefully with you and Mr. William Mitchell Kendall, of the firm of McKim, Mead and White, architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, the list of sculptors to execute the statuary proposed for the bridge, and also inspected the model of the standing figure erected at the bridge site. The height and general mass of the figure were satisfactory to the Commission. The Commission concurred in the recommendation that the pylon sculpture should be seated figures; and also approved the selection of Daniel Chester French, Herbert Adams, and James E. Fraser as sculptors of the pylon figures. The Commission suggest as alternates, A. A. Weinman and Paul Jennewein.

The Commission also inspected the model of the buffalo head at the bridge site, and it was the unanimous opinion of the Commission that the head should be more architectural and less photographic in character. Instead of the "drapery" shown in the model, the Commission suggest a simple garland of flowers.

The list of sculptors submitted for statues to be placed on the bridge proper will receive consideration later. It is understood that the sculptors for the pylons will be selected at once, and those for the statues a year or so later. However, as a sculptor requires about two years to complete a 10 or 12 foot figure, the Commission recommend that these statues for the bridge proper be authorized as soon as possible.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
Washington, D. C.

Very respectfully, yours,
Charles Moore,
Chairman.

Exhibit P

December 14, 1937.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of 1936, at their meeting on December 9, 1937, considered carefully with you and Mr. William Mitchell Randall, of the firm of Kellogg, Smith and White, architects of the Arlington Memorial Bridge, the list of sculptors to execute the statuary proposed for the bridge, and also inspected the model of the landing figure erected at the bridge site. The height and general mass of the figure were satisfactory to the Commission. The Commission concurred in the recommendation that the figure sculpture should be seated figures; and also approved the selection of Daniel Chester French, Herbert Adams, and James H. Fraser as sculptors of the figure figures. The Commission suggest as alternatives, J. M. W. Turner and J. M. W. Turner.

The Commission also inspected the model of the bridge head at the bridge site, and it was the unanimous opinion of the Commission that the head should be more architectural and less photographic in character. Instead of the "figure" shown in the model, the Commission suggest a simple design of flowers.

The list of sculptors submitted for statues to be placed on the bridge proper will receive consideration later. It is understood that the sculptors for the figure will be selected at once, and that they will be seated figures as before. However, as a sculptor requires about two years to complete a figure of 10 or 12 foot figure, the Commission recommend that some statue for the bridge proper be authorized as soon as possible.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully,
 Daniel French,
 Sculptor.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant Ed.
 Executive and Insp. Office,
 Arlington Memorial Bridge Commission,
 Washington, D. C.

COPY

December 16, 1927.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 8, 1927, approved the purchase by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for the National Capital Park System, of all the land indicated in the plats submitted with your letter of November 8th for the following park and parkway projects:

1. Shepherd Parkway.
2. Fort Stanton - Battery Rickets.
3. Foundry Branch Parkway between Reservoir Road and the River.
4. Piney Branch, north side west of 16th Street,
5. Langdon - Woodridge Park.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully, yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Lieut. Col. U. S. Grant 3d,
Executive and Disbursing Officer,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Washington, D.C.

Exhibit 2

December 10, 1937.

Dear Colonel Grant:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at their meeting on December 3, 1937, approved the proposal by the National Capital Park and Planning Commission, for the National Capital Park System, of all the land indicated in the plan submitted with your letter of November 24th for the following park and parkway projects:

1. Shepherd Parkway,
2. Fort Stanton - Battery Historic,
3. Potomac Branch Parkway between Keeneland Road and the river,
4. Inner Branch, north side west of 10th Street,
5. Langdon - Woodbridge Park.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Very respectfully,
Yours,

Charles Moore,

Chairman.

Major, Col. U. S. Grant 50,
Executive and Planning Officer,
National Capital Park and Planning Commission
Washington, D. C.

Encl. 5